DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 555 HE 010 553

AUTHOR	Bakker, Gerald R.
TITLE	Final Report to the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education from Earlham College. National Project III. Elevating the Importance of Teaching.
INSTITUTION	Earlham Coll., Richmond, Ind.
SPONS AGENCY	Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	23 Sep 77
GRANT	CEG-0-75-1930
NOTE	111p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; Consultants; *Consultation Programs; Effective Teaching; *Faculty Evaluation; Higher Education; *Instructional Improvement; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	*Earlham College IN; National Project III

ABSTRACT

Information is provided on the operation of Earlham College's consultant program, teacher evaluation policies and procedures, and the work of the Teaching and Learning Committee and other means of support for the improvement of teaching. The consultant program was designed to provide faculty with confidential help concerning their teaching. Use of the consultant was voluntary and did not affect personnel decisions. Questions brought to the consultant and the outcome of an independent evaluation of the first year of consulting work are discussed. Two studies on teacher evaluation involved collecting faculty impressions on the operation of the system and a study of a group of faculty who had just been evaluated for contract renewal. An assessment of the use of instructional development funds was conducted by an independent evaluator. The Teaching and Learning Committee has produced a newsletter to keep faculty informed on issues related to teaching and learning and arranged faculty workshops and seminars. Benefits occurring from the involvement of Earlham with the other 10 institutions of National Project III are discussed. Appendices include an issue of a report by the Teaching and Learning Committee, issues of the newsletter of the Committee, the evaluation of the faculty consultation program, policies and procedures concerning faculty evaluation, and a summary of findings on faculty opinions on the Teaching Evaluation Survey. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED162555

FINAL REPORT

to the

FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

from

EARLHAM COLLEGE

NATIONAL PROJECT III

ELEVATING THE IMPORTANCE OF TEACHING

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: HE | SP
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

September 23, 1977

Gerald R. Bakker
Earlham College
Richmond, Indiana

HE010553

Identification of Items Suitable for Dissemination

The letters and inquiries received by Earlham over the two years of our participation in National Project III can be placed in three distinct groupings. The first group of requests has been for information on the operation of our Consultant program, the second for information on our teacher evaluation policies and procedures, and the third set of requests can be related to the work of the Teaching and Learning Committee and other means of support for the improvement of teaching. It seems reasonable to assume that inquiries to FIPSE will follow the same pattern and therefore this report has been designed so that sections can be duplicated and mailed out in response to requests for information. Three convenient packets are "I Consultant on Teaching and Learning" with Appendix A, "II Teacher Evaluation" with Appendix B, and "III Other Support for Teaching" with Appendix C. Complete copies of this Final Report may be necessary for a proper response to some inquiries, but one of the three packets identified will likely satisfy the interests of most correspondents.

Introduction

For two years Earlham College has participated in National Project III, implementing the plans described in our original proposal of the spring of 1975 and collaborating with the Associates of the other ten institutions in the project. This report includes a description of what has been accomplished at Earlham and an assessment of the benefits derived from the FIPSE grant. The first section of the report deals with the work of the Consultant on Teaching and Learning. This is followed by a section on the development and current status of our faculty evaluation policies and procedures. The third section describes the work of the Teaching and Learning Committee and other programs at Earlham which support the improvement of teaching. The final section focusses on the National Project III efforts. At the end of this report are appendices which can be included in materials sent to anyone requesting information about Earlham's project work.

Final Report from Earlham College on National Project III

I. Consultant on Teaching and Learning

Five years ago it became clear to faculty members on Earlham's Faculty Affairs Committee (responsible for making recommendations on all personnel questions) that there were faculty who could profit from confidential consultation about their teaching. We did not know then how this consultation should be carried out, or whether faculty would actually make use of a Consultant, but we continued discussions on the matter and in the winter of 1975 recommended that the Faculty Meeting should approve establishment of:

> ...a half-time position to be filled by a member of the teaching faculty who would be identified as Consultant on Teaching and Learning. The duties of the Consultant would be to work with individual faculty, small groups of faculty, and the Teaching and Learning Committee to improve teaching effectiveness. The Consultant shall have the right of access to the course evaluation data and the responsibility to maintain confidentiality about the data. The Consultant will not participate in any faculty personnel decisions. His work and that of the Teaching and Learning Committee is to be separated from the work of the Academic Dean and the Faculty Affairs Committee.

This recommendation carried administrative support including a commitment to set aside a half-time salary for a Consultant. The Faculty Meeting gave its approval to the idea and the process of selecting the person for the position and defining the operation of the Consultant was begun. Faculty Affairs Committee offered the name of Gerald Bakker, and he was interviewed by this committee and the Teaching and Learning Committee. Bakker had been a member of the Earlham faculty for 16 years, was known as someone particularly interested in teaching, and had been involved in a number of instructional improvement projects. These two committees agreed that Bakker was someone the faculty would be willing to seek out as Consultant, and he was appointed as the first Consultant on Teaching and Learning for a two-year term on a half-time basis.

In the discussions that spring it was generally agreed that the following guidelines would be observed:

- Faculty use of the Consultant should be on a voluntary basis.
- The Consultant would not have access to the regularly collected data from student evaluation forms.
- The work of the Consultant would be confidential.
- The Consultant would not be involved in any personnel decisions, not even decisions on use of the Professional Development Fund. The Consultant would not be asked to write any peer evaluation letters.
- The appointment was for a two-year term with an outside evaluation to take place at the end of the first year.

The net result of the discussion and actions to June of '75 was that consultation would be voluntary, confidential, collegial and without administrative consequences. And the person chosen by the faculty was one believed to have the confidence of the faculty. There were several further characteristics of the Consultant's work which came out as time went on. First, there was always a strong content focus in any consultation, in contrast to an emphasis on teaching technique or educational technology. College teachers are more interested in what they are teaching, and techniques are significant primarily in so far as they help or hinder the students' learning of the subject material. This attention to content was probably an important factor in extending teacher-Consultant interaction over weeks of a course, or in some cases months. With extended contact the Consultant's perceptions could be sharpened or changed, and mutual trust could develop which would make conversations more productive for the teacher. Typical Consultant questions were: "What are you trying to get across?" "What perspective do students of the '70's bring to that concept?" "If the students heard what you said in class last week, why did they respond the way they did in class today?" Beginning and carrying forward with the teacher's prime interest, the subject matter, was important for the success of the Consultant's work.

Another important characteristic of the Consultant's work was that it was supportive and not critical. Every teacher does some things in his or her teaching which should be corrected, and every teacher does some things well. The experience of the Consultant these past two years gives support to that old adage about fly-catching with honey or vinegar. At a time when technology is sending men to the moon, it seems out of place to spend federal money to rediscover an old, homely truth. But teaching is such a personal matter and the ego-involvement of teachers is so high, that any Consultant who is more critical than supportive is likely to lose his audience and thus any chance to be effective.

In light of the faculty involvement in setting up the position of Consultant and selecting the person for the job, there was not much need to advertise the availability of the Consultant in the fall of 1975. But it did seem worthwhile to let the faculty know what the Consultant could do and this was provided in a Faculty Newsletter notice (Appendix A, Item 1). The Consultant also met for 30 minutes with the new faculty in the fall of '75 and '76. The faculty were also kept aware of the availability of the Consultant by reports in A Learned Journal (Appendix A, Items 2, 3, 4 & 5), notes in the Faculty Newsletter (Appendix A, Item 6), a letter to part-time teachers (Appendix A, Item 7), and by occasional references in Faculty Meeting. But personal recommendation was probably the most important means of advertisement. Evidence supporting this could be obtained by plotting distance separating the Consultant's and teacher's offices as a function of time. More to the point, however, is the judgment that formal involvement and notices are probably necessary, but not always sufficient for faculty use of a teaching consultant.

One measure of the success of the consulting program at Earlham has been the number of faculty who have made use of the Consultant's help. Over the 2-year period of the grant, 61 different faculty have worked with the Consultant out of a total of about 120 faculty, full- and part-time. This count of Consultant-teacher interactions does not include faculty who participated in workshops or seminar sessions which involved the Consultant. Thus about half of the faculty have worked with the Consultant, and that proportion is the same for each of the three divisions, the Natural Sciences, the Social Sciences, and the Humanities.

A question commonly asked about our Consultant program has been, "But are you getting to those faculty most in need of a Consultant?" There is no good, direct answer to that question, but two facts are relevant. The

Consultant has worked with some of the most highly regarded teachers on the Earlham staff and also with some whose student ratings have been at the lowest end. Furthermore, the Consultant does not see any clear evidence identifying those who are "most in need," and is busy dealing with those teachers who express their needs to him.

The initial concerns which faculty have brought to the Consultant can be grouped into three categories, having to do with student ratings, classroom performance, and course organization. With regard to student ratings, faculty wanted help in interpretion and suggestions on what to do about the ratings. Although some faculty seem unconcerned about student evaluations and the data derived from them, many others are quite anxious and spend unproductive time fretting about the numbers or the meaning of certain comments. By being available to talk about student ratings, the Consultant was able to help a number of faculty shift from worrying about ratings towards productive action in the improvement of teaching. Questions about student ratings would sometimes lead to the development of diagnostic evaluation forms more particularly suited to a specific course. At other times class observation seemed to be necessary in order to understand student ratings or comments. In one circumstance, the Consultant spoke directly with students from a class in order to gain perspective on the evaluation forms which had been turned in.

Probably the most common initial concern voiced by a teacher was about lecturing or the leading of discussion. This almost always led to some classroom observation by the Consultant followed by a discussion between the teacher and the Consultant about what had happened and why, comparing this with what had been intended. Often these discussions moved to a variety of questions beyond that initially asked, but the teacher remained in control of what was subject to analysis. The Consultant sometimes would move gently in other directions, but he did not take the position of a critic of the whole process. After the initial interview there might be anywhere from one hour of classroom observation up to 16 yours of observation usually followed by as much time discussing what had occurred.

The final category of questions brought to the Consultant had to do with course management. There were questions about how to organize student-led discussions, how to devise effective examinations, how to organize a laboratory program, how to mesh classroom work with assignments, and similar questions. Again, the Consultant viewed his position as that of a responder to teacher concerns. It was surprising to discover how many teachers found autonomous control of their courses to be a lonely position. Many need simply to talk about minor course matters, something which is inhibited by concern about "professional dignity" among colleagues. Yet minor matters can be important in how a student perceives a course and one's learning.

At the end of the first year of consulting work, an evaluator was brought in to get an outside perspective and to maintain confidentiality. Claude Mathis, Director of the Center for the Teaching Professions at Northwestern University, was brought to the campus for a two-day visit to speak with the Consultant and some faculty who had worked with the Consultant. His report (Appendix A, Item 8) was highly favorable, indicating that we had devised a program suited to our needs. Mathis' report and the publicly offered positive comments of faculty who had worked with the Consultant led us to the conclusion that we should not try to collect questionnaire data or seek further evaluation of the consulting program. We did not feel there was any warrant for further intrusion into the consulting process.

A question of major importance is: "Can the idea of a Teaching Consultant be made to work at other places besides Earlham?" Earlham is an unusual institution, or at least we think it is. We believe there is a respect for and openness about teaching which is not common. In addition, Earlham has a long record of active educational innovation. If, in addition, we have chanced upon a person with the right characteristics for Earlham of 1975-77, then one might argue that what has happened at Earlham is a purely local phenomenon and the idea of a Teaching Consultant has little or no transportability. There are gounds for arguing, however, that the idea is transportable: (1) interest in good teaching is not limited to small, liberal arts colleges, such as Earlham; (2) the demands of accountability are being felt by teachers everywhere; (3) the interest in Earlham's program is high, indicating a similar need among teachers elsewhere; and (4) the characteristics of our consulting program do not seem to be unobtainable elsewhere. We are ready to grant that the climate at Earlham is well-suited to a consulting program, but we are prepared to argue that a voluntary, confidential, collegial and faculty-designed program with a person having the confidence of fellow faculty is very likely to succeed on other campuses. The idea of a consulting service is being applied elsewhere, but not in precisely the same way it has been done at Earlham. Each institution must analyze its own situation and develop a program appropriate to its own needs. There is no simple solution which can be applied nationally, but there is a growing experience in the use of Consultants and Earlham's example is worthy of examination.

II. Teacher Evaluation

When the FIPSE grant was awarded to Earlham we had in operation a system of teacher evaluation which had evolved from something quite informal to a process based on the use of written appraisals from the teacher, his or her peers, and his or her department, along with data from student evaluation questionnaires administered in every course. We proposed carrying out an analysis of this system and extending it to cover tenured faculty as well. Before the grant period began, the faculty approved a procedure for the evaluation of tenured faculty, but rejected the accompanying proposal that departmental chairmen be given student rating data to use in the formulation of the departmental letter of recommendation. Included in the Appendix are the statements on the Assessment and Development of Tenured Faculty (Item 1), our Decision-Making Process (Item 2), and the Criteria for Appointment, Contract Renewal, and Tenure (Item 3). These documents were written as guidelines for use by Faculty Affairs Committee and the administration in carrying out personnel policy. Having written statements on personnel policy has been a valuable addition to our development of college procedures on personnel matters.

We then proceeded with an analysis of our teacher evaluation procedures. The Associate for Evaluative Studies, James McDowell, carried out two studies on teacher evaluation. The first involved collecting faculty impressions on the operation of the system, and the second was a questionnaire study of a group of faculty who had just been evaluated for contract renewal. Both of these studies (Appendix B, Items 4 & 5) indicated there were areas of our teacher evaluation system which needed improvement. In May of 1976 we then brought to our campus Robert Lisensky, President of Willamette University, for a thorough analysis from an outside perspective of our teacher evaluation and decision making procedures. Dr. Lisensky's report affirmed the basic soundness of our system, but included several key recommendations for change. The first was that the teacher should play a more active role in the evaluation process, organizing with the Dean his or her own case for consideration. The second recommendation was that the use of student evaluation forms in all courses be strongly encouraged, but not required. In addition, Dr. Lisensky made several suggestions of ways to get improved written appraisals from students and colleagues. After discussion by an ad hoc committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee, these changes were accepted by the Faculty Meeting. The overall purposes of the changes were to make the whole process more humane and to provide fairer and more substantial evidence for the judgments reached.

Personnel decisions at Earlham are based on the three traditional categories of teaching, scholarship, and service, but of primary concern is the quality and effectiveness of a person's teaching. Student evaluation of teaching includes solicited letters and data from student evaluation forms. We presently use three forms: our own which asks for written comments and has a single rating question (Appendix B, Item 6), the Purdue CAFETERIA form, and the McKeachie form. We have tried to encourage an awareness of the distinction between evaluation for administrative purposes and evaluation for the purpose of improvement. The Teaching and Learning

Committee urged this distinction upon the faculty when we shifted a year ago to the present short rating form. Success in this area is limited, for some faculty at Earlham still equate any student evaluation with data in the hands of the Faculty Affairs Committee. There are, however, other faculty who make thoughtful and effective use of diagnostic forms for their own efforts at improvement of their teaching.

There remains yet the question as to whether all the effort put into evaluation has had any net effect towards the improvement of teaching. There are some who sincerely doubt that the net effect has been positive. If one were to look simply at the use of diagnostic student evaluation forms, it seems hard to imagine that the effect would not be positive, even if it might be small. But there is the mixing of the goals of evaluation for administrative and diagnostic purposes, and there is a great toll in time due to the detailed procedures we now follow. There is also the factor of teacher morale, and we have seen clear examples of reduced teaching effectiveness directly related to worry over student rating data and fear of evaluation procedures. Evaluation efforts serve the dual purpose of improving the decision-making process and raising the quality of teaching. We are confident that better decisions are now being made, and we are making progress on using evaluation to improve teaching. For a broader perspective on teacher evaluation there is included in the Appendix (Item 7) a copy of Criteria VI assembled by the National Project III Associates.

Final Report from Earlham College on National Project III

III. Other Support for Teaching

The Earlham project funded through the FIPSE grant included three elements, a Consultant program, an analysis of our teacher evaluation procedures, and the further development of other mechanisms for the support of teaching. In the last category we proposed an assessment of our use of instructional development funds and an extension of the work of the Teaching and Learning Committee. To accomplish the first of these goals we brought to the campus Professor Stanford Ericksen of the University of Michigan. Dr. Ericksen spent two days talking with the Academic Dean, the members of our Professional Development Fund Committee, and faculty who had received instructional development grants. The gist of Dr. Ericksen's report was that we should carefully control the use of this money to insure that we are in fact getting instructional improvement. The Professional Development Fund Committee discussed the report and made changes in the policies of the committee. Further changes in the public guidelines will be made in the fall of 1977. Included in Appendix C is the set of guidelines followed last year (Item 1). The report on the use of the funds last year will be available within a month. We were pleased with the results of Dr. Ericksen's visit and are convinced that instructional development projects are achieving appropriate goals.

The Teaching and Learning Committee has carried out a number of tasks with support from the FIPSE grant. A newsletter entitled "A Learned Journal" has been published for the last two years to keep faculty informed of a variety of things related to teaching and learning (Appendix C, Items 2, 3, 4). Reports on the work of the Teaching Consultant have kept the faculty aware of this program. Work done by the faculty to improve their teaching has also been covered. The response of the faculty to "A Learned Journal" is uniformly but mildly positive. The committee will have to consider at its first meeting this fall whether we should continue publication of "A Learned Journal" or write regular reports in the Faculty Newsletter, a well-read weekly newsletter containing all sorts of college news.

Another responsibility of the Teaching and Learning Committee has been the arranging of workshops and seminars for the faculty. In the past two years programs have been arranged on computer assisted instruction, synectics, listening skills, the use of student evaluation data, teaching skill-deficient students, new methods of language instruction, the application of Piaget to science education, bibliographic instruction and the use of discussions in the classroom. Over the years the Earlham faculty have organized and participated in many different lectures, seminars, workshops, etc. on teaching and learning matters, and this will continue. However, the FIPSE grant enabled us to develop a good set of offerings these past two years. We hope to continue in this fashion as specific needs arise and wherever the interest can be fostered.

One group which has met several times this past year is a small group of older faculty, mainly those in the last ten years of their teaching. We are learning, as we should have known, that the needs and interests and concerns of faculty vary considerably with age.

In our original proposal to FIPSE we wrote of trying to determine the relative advantages of various means we have used in the past to improve teaching. After learning of a faculty interview project at Ohio Wesleyan University, a fellow institution in National Project III, we decided to shift the design of what we planned to do in order to incorporate the idea of faculty interviewing each other about teaching. The statement of how the interviews were to be conducted, and the report summarizing the results of the interview project are included in Appendix C (Items 5 & 6). There were five clusters of things identified from the interviews which had had an influence on the development of the teaching of Earlham faculty. These were teaching climate, student feedback, teacher models, meeting new challenges, and working in one's discipline. Participating in the interview project was considered very worthwhile by all who were involved, which was about half the faculty.

Work with National Project III Associates

The involvement of Earlham with the other ten institutions of National Project III turned out to have benefits which had not been anticipated at the time the original proposal was written. The initial conversations with the FIPSE staff revealed glimpses of what might happen, but it was not until the Associates had worked together for awhile that the group became fully aware of the potential benefits of collaboration. In our meetings we did provide mutual support and critical analysis of what we were doing in our individual projects. To be specific, Earlham learned from Stan Ericksen how a support center could function and how to manage instructional development funds better. Dick Owens provided valuable, specific suggestions about the day-to-day work of a Teaching Consultant. Steve Scholl was helpful in suggesting the faculty interview technique. And, finally, Warren Siebert gave good information on the use of the CAFETERIA system. In many other small ways, conversations with the Associates were useful for what we were doing on campus and for seeing our work in a larger perspective. Each of the Associates should be able to provide a similar list of benefits derived from our work together. While we did not get into each other's projects in enough detail to be reliable judges or evaluators, we did learn enough to be able to work together on our dissemination efforts.

Most of the work done by the Associates was on dissemination efforts with the most conspicuous result, the Criteria series. The national readership indicates some significant awareness of National Project III, even if there is no evidence thus far that all our good advice has been followed.

The details on the assembling of Criteria and our meetings with other groups should appear in the Resource Institution report. The Earlham representative participated fully in this work, with the largest amount of time being spent on Criteria IV,"Professional Development of Faculty."

Earlham has also been active in telling people about our work on this project and our involvement in National Project III. Requests for information have been received from 148 persons and have been answered with letters and printed materials. The Consultant has had half a dozen opportunities to speak about his work at professional meetings. A number of requests for further information have been brought back by faculty or administrators who had spoken of our work and National Project III at some professional meeting. The idea of a Teaching Consultant seems to be an intriguing idea, and teachers at institutions ranging from the University of Minnesota to Deerfield Academy have expressed strong interest. Many teachers seem to feel a real need for someone who is available to talk to teachers about their difficulties and questions. The Great Lakes Colleges Association is currently seeking funds to implement a Consultant program on member campuses.

The concept of grouping eleven very different institutions and their projects under one umbrella has been fruitful and challenging. Not all has been accomplished which might have been done in the cross-validation of the concepts and conclusions of our individual projects. Nor will the nation hereafter refer to the years of '75-'77 as the years in which teaching was elevated to paramount importance in all our colleges and universities. But solid work has been done individually and together, and teachers and administrators have heard about it.

Conclusion

The impact of the FIPSE grant on the Earlham campus has been substantial. We have now secured funds from the Mellon Foundation to continue the work of the Consultant on Teaching and Learning, and to underwrite the Professional Development Fund. We are firmly convinced of their value and importance. The FIPSE grant has permitted us to establish solidly these programs and the work of the Teaching and Learning Committee, and also to review and improve our teacher evaluation procedures.

Appendix A, Item 1 Consultant on Teaching and Learning

What will I be doing this year as Consultant on Teaching and Learning? The minutes of the Faculty Meeting specify that the Consultant is to "work with individual faculty, small groups of faculty and the Teaching and Learning Committee to improve teaching effectiveness." This provides sufficient latitude for doing a wide variety of things.

Along with the Teaching and Learning Committee, I hope to develop a variety of workshops or seminars on those topics which are of sufficient interest to the faculty. A brief questionnaire will be distributed at the Faculty Retreat listing possible topics. Your expression of interest will help us determine where we should direct our efforts.this year.

With individual faculty or small groups, I am available to work directly on the improvement of the teaching and learning process. This will most likely be tied to on-going courses, but could be in course or curricular development. I will respond to requests as they are presented to me, without a pre-planned program of what I should or must do. After an initial conversation to find out where help is needed and what I can usefully do, there are a number of ways we can proceed. I can do any or all of the following things:

- Sit in on one or more classes and discuss afterwards what appeared to be happening from a point of view different from that of the teacher or student.
- Arrange for video-taping of a class to provide a basis for self-analysis or further discussion.
- Arrange for another Earlham faculty member or a GLCA Consultant to provide consulting help. For instance, on this campus we could set up mutual visitations for as long as seem appropriate.
- Read course evaluation forms and help a person interpret what is being said about his teaching.
- Provide evaluation forms from my files or help a teacher devise a set of questions which can provide good diagnostic information.
- Provide references to a wide variety of topics ranging from studies on course evaluation to curricular and teaching innovations in a particular discipline.
- Participate in a discussion of course objectives and ways of meeting those objectives.

The above list does not exhaust the possibilities. I see it as my job to try to respond sympathetically to the interests and concerns of the teacher who calls on me, whether it be simply for a bibliographic reference or for extensive consultation, visitation and discussion.

Any Earlham faculty member can call on me, be they experienced or beginners, tenured or non-tenured, full or part-time, good teachers or not so good teachers. I am here to serve in any way I can.

On the matter of confidentiality, it is my clear intention that the form and substance of any work I do as a Consultant with individual faculty will be kept in the strictest confidence. As for course evaluation data, I will see nothing other than what a teacher chooses to show me. It has also been firmly established that I will not in any way be involved in the process of making faculty personnel decisions, such as on contract renewal or tenure.

If you think I can help, or if you have any questions, call me on Ext. 319 or drop a note in my faculty box, #46.

Jerry Bakker

VOLUME I Number 1 EARLHAM COLLEGE, RICHMOND, INDIANA October 30, 1975

This is the first issue of a report which the Teaching and Learning Committee plans to publish 4-6 times a year. New teaching ideas, reports of what is going on at Earlham, plus reviews of current literature will all be included. If you wish to help out with writing or editing, see Jerry Bakker, Bonnie Frick, Jim McDowell, Jim Smith, or David Weening.

Earlham Part of National Project III - Elevating the Importance of Teaching

In June, the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) announced that Earlham will be one of eleven schools working together in National Project III - Elevating the Importance of Teaching. The eleven schools in National Project III, along with 165 other institutions, were selected for support out of a total of 2800 which submitted proposals to FIPSE this year.

National Project III brings together a group of institutions, which were judged to have demonstrated effective approaches to elevating the importance of teaching. These institutions are Earlham, Ball State, Bucknell, Burlington Community College, Illinois, Kansas State, Michigan (also serving as resource institution), Ohio Wesleyan, Purdue, SUNY at Oswego, and SUNY Central Administration. These Associate institutions are charged with refining the effective practices they now employ and providing clear and useful guidelines to other institutions and agencies interested in improving teaching and elevating its importance. In practice this means first that each institution will have an on-campus project dealing with the improvement of teaching. Then together the Associate institutions will try to assess which approaches have been most effective in elevating the importance of teaching and improving its quality, and also devise ways to disseminate this information in a form useful to other institutions.

---

*We have not been able to agree on a title. The person who proposes a title which is used for subsequent issues will receive a free copy of Erickson's book, "Motivation for Learning: A Guide for the Teacher of the Young Adult" reviewed on page 4 of this issue. Submit your title to Bonnie Frick.

Earlham, as one of the Associate institutions, has received a grant of $25,000 for 1975-76, with the expectation of a similar amount for the following year. In the FIPSE news release the Earlham project was described rather tersely as follows:

> " Concern for the quality of teaching at Earlham has been implemented in a variety of ways. Curricular innovation has always been vigorously encouraged. A Teaching and Learning Committee was established in 1965 to coordinate efforts at improving the quality of instruction. A faculty development fund, set up in 1968, now allocates $60,000 yearly to foster professional development and increase the effectiveness of teaching. An "internal foundation" (since 1970) disburses institutional funds for educational innovation. A senior faculty member has been appointed to serve half-time as a Consultant on Teaching and Learning. A process for evaluation of faculty has been devised which incorporates evaluation by students, colleagues, the department and the teacher himself. This procedure is now being extended to cover tenured faculty. The effectiveness of faculty evaluation procedures is currently being assessed. There will also be evaluations of the use of professional development funds and the work of the Consultant on Teaching and Learning."

The project director is Jerry Bakker. He will work with the Teaching and Learning Committee and with Jim McDowell as Director of Evaluative Studies. Joe Elmore will also be involved, as most of the elements of the project are under his direct supervision.

The National Project III Associates (Project Directors) met this past July for two days at Ann Arbor to begin their collaborative work. Much of the time was spent on learning what the eleven projects are and laying out an agenda for meetings in September, November and January. Should anyone wish to find out what is included in the eleven projects, the summaries, abstracts and complete proposals, including appendices, are available.

In September, the Associates met along with all the other FIPSE project directors at the Illinois Beach Lodge north of Chicago, About half the time was spent on topics of interest to the project directors generally. The projects supported by FIPSE are diverse and unusual, ranging from courses offered to St. Regis Paper Mill employees and families by the Maine Maritime Academy, to the development of a natural resources majors for American Indians at Humboldt State University in California. A number of schools are re-examining the traditional objectives and content of liberal and general education (competency-based education and the like).

Others are focusing on experiential learning, and still others are trying to reach groups now poorly served by postsecondary educational institutions. The vitality and variety of work being supported by FIPSE can best be savored by looking at the 1-page project descriptions in the Faculty Lounge of Lilly Library.

The Associates of National Project III also spent two days examining faculty evaluation and how it is related to effective teaching. We heard reports from Warren Seibert of Purdue on the CAFETERIA system and from Dick Owens on the student rating form used at Kansas State. We also discussed peer evaluation of faculty as part of the overall picture of faculty evaluation. Our first attempt at dissemination will be in the form of a Newsletter to be prepared periodically at the University of Michigan and distributed as widely as possible. As Associates we do not see ourselves as experts on all the aspects of postsecondary teaching. Rather we believe we can offer a collective judgment on some things which seem worthwile, based primarily on experiences on our home campuses.

The November meeting of the Associates will be devoted to examining the use of institutional funds for instructional development. We shall look at small grant programs and award systems. In our experience at Earlham, we seem to have found in curricular innovation a very effective means of improving teaching. Please pass on any comments or concerns you have on these matters.

Jerry Bakker

Some Developments in Earlham's Teaching

For the first time Earlham students will be offered an opportunity to begin a lab sequence in the spring term when GEOLOGY 11 will be offered as a program video-taped and synchronized with slides to be studied by the students as convenient to them. Chuck Martin and Ansel Gooding are taping their current lectures for use later in the year as a means to spread out over a full year what has always been an uneven course load. The experiment may also answer, for those who were curious, the question of whether taping can be achieved successfully when done from a live course, rather than being separately filmed as a canned course. Students will experience an additional flexibility within the limits imposed by lab and examination schedules, while the teachers may gain a new appreciation of the possibilities for using videotaping to teach specific skills (e.g. use of equipment) or in illustrating irreproduceable phenomena (e.g. floods).

The recently instituted Peace and Conflict Studies (PACS) sequence is designed to offer a core experience for students interested in Peace Studies. It deals with peace and conflict issues from the point of view of six different disciplines: Sociology, Social Psychology, Political Science, Philosophy, Religion, and Economics. The program is not aimed at development majors in peace studies, instead it is meant to allow students to sample various disciplines necessary to a liberal arts education while at the same time focusing on a common set of problems. The sequence is recommended, not required, and each of the four courses involved offers a distribution credit. The program has been carefully put together and when coupled with a summer's practicum or internship should give the student a clear understanding of the issues and problems involved in the field. For more information on this program contact Howard Richards in the Peace Studies Office, Earlham Hall.

Bonnie Frick

Review: MOTIVATION FOR LEARNING: A GUIDE FOR THE TEACHER OF THE YOUNG ADULT, by Stanford C. Erickson, the University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1974, $9.50.

Why does Erickson choose "motivation" as the key word in the title of a widely ranging book on the craft of college teaching? "Higher education," he writes, "has not yet fully realized the intellectual and personal power of the individual student who has been given a chance to progress at his own pace and within his own style of learning and thinking." But obviously, "Offering educational freedom to the individual student is not giving him license to do what he pleases and where." How to reconcile a large measure of freedom for students with standards of solid performance? Here lies the challenge to which his book is addressed.

The teacher, says Erickson, has three responsibilities: First, "to assess the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be required of his students;" second, to provide instructional arrangements which will most likely support the attainment of those outcomes; third, to establish an instructional plan whereby each student received evaluative information when needed to direct his course of study toward the agreed upon objectives." To emphasize his perspective on the last point, "The summative grade at the end of a course is relatively unimportant. It says too little and comes too late."

To guide the teacher in facing these responsibilities, Erickson offers a distillate from much of the best writing on college teaching of the past 15 years. He deals with learning theory, emphasizing such practical issues as what makes learning transferable beyond the specific assignment or course; how to guide students to critical thinking, original thinking, solving problems, remembering and forgetting; the role of reinforcement.

He deals with setting objectives, introducing the notably useful Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, and the use of performance criteria as in the Keller Plan. On motivation as such, Erickson writes, "If the teacher is sensitive to the self-actualizing needs of students, a quite different teaching role will be seen than if a major concern is the need for high academic achievement." "Well-organized subject matter leading to relevant objectives and with constructive feedback along the way does more to counter apathy, indifference, or negativism than do efforts to attack motivation directly." He illustrates ways of relating content to student concerns; he discusses how attention to the dynamics of faculty-student and student-student interaction can enrich the student's educational experience.

Erickson is a senior research person at the Center for Teaching and Learning at the University of Michigan. He is editor of the Center's series Memo to the Faculty and editor of the annual abstracts of instructional innovations in Big Ten Universities. His book is readable and usable; certainly one of the best handy works on college teaching. Put it alongside McKeachie's Tips for Teachers and Rogers' Freedom to Learn.

Jim McDowell

Using Examinations To Teach

A teacher can list course objectives in great detail and frequently remind students of them, but it is through examinations that students really find out what we wanted them to learn. And the form of an examination can be important in telling our students how we want them to learn.

Recently, in some upper-class chemistry courses, I have emphasized two objectives, (a) student responsibility for the teaching-learning process, and (b) the value of cooperative work. For this purpose I have chosen to borrow from Jerry Woolpy an examination procedure as follows: Four days before the examination is to be given, the students are asked to submit questions which provide the basis for the "Examination List of Questions." I then edit, modify, merge, and add one or two questions in order to provide a set of approximately 30 questions, which are then duplicated and handed out to the students within 24 hours. The students are urged to be as cooperative and helpful to each other as possible in working out their own set of answers to the Examination List of Questions.

The Examination itself consists of 6 or 7 questions which I select directly from the List and the students are to answer these, closed book, during a 1-hour class period. The questions selected are those which give appropriate coverage of the material and are in my judgment the most reasonable questions.

The grading of the examinations is usually, though not necessarily, done by the class the next day. A set of appropriate answers is worked out in class discussion, and then each written answer is read and graded by at least two students. The final numerical grade for each answer is assigned by me, but each student can see his own paper and the student grades before he leaves.

With this examination procedure the student is actively involved in setting the examination himself. He must think about how he will frame questions, not just how he will try to answer my questions. The fact that the questions on the Examination List of Questions are really student questions is quite obvious, for there is both more creativity and more of a rough-hewn quality than my questions usually reveal. Student involvement in the examination writing has been a clear plus. It is clear that there is real student responsibility even in the evaluation part of the course. The students exercise a proprietary interest in their own education.

Cooperative work has also flourished. Given the precise set of questions from which the examination questions will be chosen, the students quickly find that working together is more efficient than working alone. Their work is also far more focused, for they know what they have to do to be prepared. Further, I am more productively drawn into their work, for I am seen as more of an ally who can help them prepare, than as an examiner whom they must outguess.

Student performance on examinations of this type has been very good. Working out 30 essay answers leads to a more complete coverage of the material than usual. Students work harder and more efficiently for these examinations.

This is a brief description of a few of the things I have learned using this examination style. Jerry Woolpy and I are planning to do a more detailed analysis of how modifying the above examination procedure makes it suited for various teaching objectives. Any comments or suggestions you may wish to offer will be greatly appreciated.

Jerry Bakker

Appendix A, Item 3

A LEARNED JOURNAL

VOL. 1 NO. 4
TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE
EARLHAM COLLEGE, RICHMOND IND.

June 1, 1976

Some Faculty Development Activities at Earlham

Within a month I shall have to write a report describing the work supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE). Earlham was selected last Spring, along with ten other schools, to be part of the FIPSE National Project III - Elevating the Importance of Teaching; we had proposed to carry out work of a faculty development nature and participate in disseminating the results of all post-secondary educational institutions. It seems appropriate also to provide for the faculty an overview of project work, recognizing that this is only a slice of the faculty development and teaching improvement work going on at Earlham.

Should one evaluate the work of those who have evaluated our system of faculty evaluation? Only at the risk of an infinite regression which would ignore our chief purpose, the education of students. Let me simply list what has been done. Last year students were polled for their reactions to the student rating forms in use. This winter those faculty who had gone through the evaluation process for contract renewal or a tenure decision were asked for their judgments on the process. Two weeks ago, Robert Lisensky, President of Willamette College, was on campus to talk to students, faculty, Faculty Attairs Committee and Student Faculty Affairs Committee about our whole faculty evaluation system. In addition to his perceptions shared during his visit, Bob Lisensky will submit a formal report to Joe Elmore in several weeks. The hope is that we will be able to make changes in our procedure which will make it more fair, efficient and humane.

Our use of the Professional Development Fund was examined in March by Stan Ericksen from the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching at the University of Michigan. Stan offered useful suggestions on how we can keep the focus in handling of this money on the improvement of the quality of teaching.

My work this year as Consultant has been challenging, interesting, and it has even been fun. When I go back to the list in the Faculty Newsletter of last September of the things I said I might do, I find I have done all of them. Altogether, some 27 faculty have talked to me in my role as Consultant, with the amount of time spent together ranging from a couple of hours up to 16-18 hours, half of the latter being classroom observation. That's where I have had the chance to work on my own undergraduate education again. Sometimes I think an education is too good to waste on the young. Certainly, I have enjoyed attending classes, reading the assignments when I can and having the opportunity to get all my questions answered by the teacher afterwards. The faculty I have worked with represent the three Divisions almost equally, with about 80% being non-tenured. Claude Mathis, Director of the Center for the Teaching Professions at Northwestern University, was at Earlham for two days looking at the work I have been doing as Consultant on Teaching and Learning. His report will examine the position as it was set up at Earlham, how it has been filled this year, and to what extent the same thing can be done on other campuses.

The Teaching and Learning Committee has been active this year in a number of ways. This newsletter comes from the TLC. Workshops and discussion groups have been organized on the following topics: computer-assisted instruction, values clarification, bibliographic instruction, synectics, video-taping of teaching, and the use of student ratings. TLC has worked on collecting and making available some evaluation forms which serve primarily a diagnostic function. The committee is also looking into group participation training (Indiana University), and is planning to bring a person here next Fall from Oklahoma who is an expert on discussion and listening techniques. The faculty interview project has been managed by TLC, and an analysis and summary will be written in June of the interview reports now filtering in. Earlham faculty seem to be, from the reports read so far, perceptive interviewers and thoughtful writers.

The faculty development work at Earlham and National Project III are becoming known on a national scale. The first issue of the Criteria, a National Project III report, has produced a number of inquiries about what is happening here at Earlham. This year I have had contact, either by letter or in person, with people at 24 different institutions beyond the group of eleven schools within National Project III. By contact, I mean either describing in some detail what we are doing at Earlham and then following with written materials, or responding to letters of inquiry. There is no question about the fact that Earlham is being heard about and people are interested in the same questions we are.

Jerry Bakker

The Idea of the Humanities

(This is an excerpt taken from an address given by Ronald S. Crane of the University of Chicago at Carleton College in February 1953.)

We have now tried out two common ways of answering our question of what exactly are the humanities--first, by pointing to certain subjects that are officially or conventionally designated as humanistic, and, second, by specifying the large and noble purposes which humanistic study may be supposed to serve; and we have found neither of them entirely satisfactory. There is, however, a third, and more promising, way of approaching our question--a way which is suggested by one of the earlier documents in which the term "humanities" occurs (in its singular Latin form of humanitas, or humanity). The document is the work of a minor Latin grammarian (or professor of language and literature) of the second century; and in it "humanity" is defined simply as "education and training in the good arts" or disciplines; and the goodness of these arts is made to reside in the fact that those who earnestly desire and seek after them come to be most highly humanized, in the sense of being endowed with the virtues and knowledge that separate men most sharply from the lower animals. Let me try to say what I think this implies in modern terms.

It is a view that identifies the humanities, not with certain subjects of study merely, or with the pursuit of certain abstract ends, but with the proper cultivation of certain arts or disciplines, that is, of certain means; and it makes the humanistic character of such arts or methods to consist in their peculiar capacity to deal with those aspects of human experience that differentiate man most completely from the animals, to the end that individual men may actualize as fully as possible their potentialities as men.

But what are the aspects of human experience that distinguish men most completely, now and in the past, from the animals? I think the answer is not hard to give. They consist, generally, in all those things which, because not all men or all groups of men can, or do, do them, are therefore not amenable to adequate explanation in terms of general laws of natural processes, physical or biological, or in terms of collective social conditions or forces. They are the things which we cannot predict, in any scientific way, that men individually or in groups will do, but which, when they are done, we recognize as signs, not of any natural or social necessities, but of possibilities inherent in man's peculiar nature. They are, in short what we commonly speak of as human achievements--whether in sciences, in institutions, or in the arts. And, more especially, they are those human achievements, like Newtonian or modern physics, the American Constitution, or Shakespearean tragedy, to which we agree in attributing that kind of unprecedented excellence that calls forth wonder as well as admiration.

These, wherever we find them are the distinctive objects of the humanities; and the aim of the humanities is precisely such an understanding, appreciation, and use of them as will most completely preserve their character as human achievements that cannot be completely resolved into either natural processes common to men and animals or into impersonal forces affecting all the members of a given society. In any field of study, however, whether in the natural sciences, the social sciences, or the humanities, everything depends on the kinds of questions we ask, and the habits of thinking about these which we bring to the study. We can read a tragedy of Shakespeare in such ways that it becomes hardly distinguishable from a western melodrama or a high school exercise in parsing; we can study the American Constitution and miss everything that makes it unique in the world; we can, by our mode of examination, take away from Newton all that Newton peculiarly was. The mode of examination therefore--the method of approach and discussion--is all-important; and that is why we cannot say what the humanities are, in general or at any time or in any college or university, without giving first place in our definition to the "good arts" or disciplines through which, and only through which, the humanistic aspects of human achievements are accessible to us or have power to nourish our minds, refine our sensibilities, or civilize our actions. For the humanities are, in a very real sense, identical with these arts or disciplines, and they prosper in any time or place in proportion as the disciplines prosper in which they have their tangible being.

The history of the humanities from the Greeks to the present is the story of how many philosophers, many rhetoricians, many logicians, many grammarians, philologists, critics, and historians have unconsciously cooperated in the discovery, formulation, and refinement of techniques of all sorts suited to the isolation and appreciation of the humanistic aspects of human achievements. These techniques are all available to us if we wish to use them; they may be classified very roughly into four principal groups of humanistic methods or arts. There are the arts, first of all, of language, comprising the many varied techniques we have for dealing with the symbolic media in which the achievements of men are embodied or through which they reach us, from grammar in the ordinary sense, through prosody, rhetoric, the simpler parts of logic, and textual criticism, to the refinements of modern general linguistics. There are the arts, in the second place, of which the special province is the analysis and appreciation of ideas--of the conceptions and reasons, of all kinds, which men have expressed either in the elaborate forms of philosophic, scientific, and religious systems or more informally in works of literature and fine art. In the third place, there are the arts of literary and artistic criticism--the numerous devices at our disposal for grasping and appreciating the esthetic structures which men have made. And, finally, there are the arts that give us knowledge and understanding of the particular historical situations and causes in the midst of which the objects of humanistic study have emerged.

Linguistics, the analysis of ideas, literary and artistic criticism, and historiography--these are the four constituent elements of the humanities when the humanities are defined in terms of the "good arts" which their successful cultivation presupposes.

Appendix A, Item 4

A LEARNED JOURNAL

VOL. 2 NO. 1
TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE
EARLHAM COLLEGE, RICHMOND IND.
October 15, 1976

Faculty Interview Project

Last year the Teaching and Learning Committee carried out a project in which about one-fourth of the faculty at Earlham were interviewed by other faculty. The purpose of the project was to look for factors which had influenced the development of teaching of Earlham faculty. The chief interview question was, "What have been the main influences on your development as a teacher?" Interviews usually ranged up to an hour in length and the reports were from 1 to 2 pages long. From personal comments, separate notes, and the reports themselves, it was clear that the faculty had enjoyed getting together to talk about teaching. Those interviewed had an average of about 15 years of teaching experience, usually most of that at Earlham, and those who conducted the interviews were faculty who had been at Earlham four years or less. Interviewer--interviewee assignments were made with an eye to setting up compatible pairs and getting interviews across divisional lines.

Teaching is a complex process and faculty did not report a single main influence on their teaching. Nor could one identify a single event or person or program which had influenced the teaching of a number of faculty. But it is possible to identify six clusters of things which have been influential in the development of the teaching of Earlham faculty.

TEACHING CLIMATE Most frequently mentioned in the reports were things such as "atmosphere of the place," "the attitude towards teaching," "ongoing curricular innovation," "conversations with other teachers," "administrative support for instructional improvement," "importance of teaching and learning," and the like. It is difficult to define this category precisely, and it may be that better questions would have produced greater clarity, yet there is strong support for the idea that faculty have been influenced by a general atmosphere supportive of good teaching. Teachers talk about teaching here; innovation and experimentation are supported; what happens to student learning is important in the decision-making process.

STUDENT FEEDBACK Many teachers spoke of the importance in their teaching of the responses of students. This was the day-to-day response as noted in the laboratory, in personal conversations, in the field, in working together on research projects, or in the classroom. For these teachers, student feedback was a factor which affected how they teach, not just an intrinsic reward for good teaching. It is significant that of those who mentioned formal student evaluations, all but one felt that these evaluations were of no value or had a negative impact on their teaching. Where student feedback influenced teaching was in the informal, daily contact which provided clues as to what was working and what was not.

TEACHER MODELS A number of faculty reported that they were aware of specific individuals who served in some way as models for their own teaching. In some cases a set of ideals was seen as worth following, sometimes a particular personal trait or teaching technique was mentioned, and sometimes a pattern of working with students was specified. Faculty are selective in what they choose to emulate in their models, using that which suits their own teaching styles. Some of the models were undergraduate teachers, some graduate teachers or thesis advisors, and some fellow Earlham faculty.

MEETING NEW CHALLENGES A significant influence in the teaching of a number of faculty was the successful meeting of a new challenge. Teachers tried something new and found it worked. They spoke of how reluctance and trepidation became converted into a growing self-confidence. A number of teachers talked about the importance of experience and how an awareness of what one could do successfully could contribute to self-confidence, a necessary element of good teaching. It is disturbing to consider the possibility that increasing the emphasis on the improvement of teaching may, in fact, undermine this necessary self-confidence.

> **WORKING IN ONE'S DISCIPLINE** The interview questions were not cast in such a way as to elicit responses related to a teacher's discipline, yet a number of faculty reported that they found a significant influence there. Research, either with or without students, was considered important. Teachers find inspiration in their own subject matter. Reading in one's field and doing scholarly work were reported as having an impact on teaching. Teachers in the performing arts find performance to be important.

The faculty interview project has not uncovered a previously hidden lever one can pull to improve the quality of teaching. It showed again how complex and individualistic a process teaching is, and it showed the importance of an atmosphere supportive of good teaching. Perhaps most importantly, faculty were brought together in another way to talk about teaching, the chief function of an educational institution.

Jerry Bakker
Jim McDowell
David Weening

Library Workshop Being Planned

Last January, the library staff offered a bibliographic instruction workshop, to discuss ways in which the library had been used and could be used to enhance classroom teaching and learning or independent study. About 25 faculty participated, and the results were reported in A Learned Journal (v. 1, no. 3). Several other faculty expressed an interest in another such workshop, and we are tentatively planning one for this coming January. Personal invitations will be forthcoming, but if anyone has a particular interest in attending, please let me know.

Evan Farber

What Has Happened to Senior Year Studies?

The Senior Year Studies Program proposal was submitted to the National Endowment for the Humanities on July 1. The proposal represents the hopes of many Earlham faculty for a senior year experience which will provide a capstone for the general education course work which seniors have taken over the four years, and also make the senior year more effective as a preparation for the transition to life beyond the campus.

The general structure of the program provides for the introduction of more than a dozen new courses, taught by faculty members who have already expressed interest and developed new course outlines. Each course would use a single theme to draw together insights students have gained in previous courses, and allow application to career objectives, and/or the life beyond college in general. These courses, as well as the other parts of the program, are explained in detail in the proposal itself, a copy of which is in the faculty lounge in the library.

Adjunct components of the program would include a variety of on-campus activities for seniors, including non-credit offerings, and a number of seminars. We hope to join to the Senior Year Program a proposal for a post-graduation internship program, which will be presented to the faculty later. The latter program is still in the first stages of thinking.

The National Endowment considered, but did not decide on, our proposal at their September meeting. We anticipate that no decision will be reached until after a site visit.

If funded, the program will be directed at Earlham by Richard Johnson who has rejoined the Earlham faculty this year. The details of the program, including course offerings, will be brought to the faculty through the usual channels for approval if the program is funded. If you would like to be involved in the program, or want to know more about it, see Len Clark.

Len Clark

How Earlham is Being Described to the Rest of the World

The FIPSE grant to Earlham has focused considerable attention on what we are doing to support and improve teaching. Many people have written letters asking about various things going on here. On October 17-19 there will be a meeting of the Professional and Organizational Development Network at Airlie House near Washington, D.C. Over 200 people interested in faculty development will attend this meeting at which there will be a presentation of what is happening in faculty development at Earlham. Distributed to all the participants will be a booklet containing one-page descriptions of faculty development programs at schools around the country. Below is the description of the Earlham program which will be included. It seems appropriate to let the faculty here see how we are being seen by the rest of the world, or at least a small segment of it.

Earlham College

Faculty development at Earlham is supported by a number of diverse activities administered in a somewhat decentralized fashion.

Teaching and Learning Committee - This faculty committee is concerned with improving the quality of teaching and learning at Earlham. Last year workshops were organized for faculty on computer-assisted instruction, values clarification, the creative use of student ratings, synectics, and the use of video-taping. In addition, a newsletter is published dealing with matters related to teaching.

Consultant on Teaching and Learning - A member of the faculty, Gerald Bakker, was selected after wide consultation with the faculty to serve half-time as a confidential consultant for those individuals and groups who wished help on teaching or curricular matters. Last year over one-fourth of the faculty made use of the consultant, most of them on an individual basis. Support for this work has been provided for two years by the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education.

Consultant on Instructional Development - A new half-time position, filled by Richard Johnson, will provide for consultation on analysis and design of courses. Major emphases will be on designing courses from student and instructor goals, developing learning situations suited to student abilities and progress, and using appropriate instructional techniques and technology. Some of the support for this work is provided by a grant from the Mellon Foundation.

Professional Development-Fund - From this fund, grants of up to several thousand dollars are awarded by a faculty committee for a wide variety of small projects designed in some way to improve teaching. The $60,000 budgeted for this each year is beyond that budgeted for sabbaticals.

Internal Foundation - Each year approximately $30,000 is allocated by a committee, which includes faculty, for the development and implementation of new ideas such as Living-Learning courses and intensive language programs.

Other Activities - There are special funds available for faculty development in Japanese Studies. In the social sciences a major, new interdisciplinary program is being developed, The Center for Human Development and Social Relations. Day-long workshops have been organized on bibliographic instruction and A-V techniques.

For further information write or call:

Gerald Bakker, Prof. of Chemistry and Consultant
or on Teaching and Learning
Joe Elmore, Provost and Dean of Academic Affairs
Earlham College, Richmond IN 47374
(317) 962-6561

Memo to the Faculty - From the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, University of Michigan

Since 1963 the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching has published brief reports on various matters important to teachers. Each of these reports deals with a particular subject in a manner designed to be directly useful to teachers. Brief bibliographies are always included. I have in my office a nearly complete set of these memos and would be pleased to share individual reports with faculty who are interested. Drop me a note or call, and I will send you whatever you would like to see. Below are the titles of some recent issues.

Jerry Bakker

Memo No.	Year	Title
30	1968	The Lecture
33	1969	Learning Theory and the Teacher, I. Memory
34	1969	Learning Theory and the Teacher, II. Transfer of Learning
35	1969	The Teacher-Made Test
37	1969	Learning the Teaching Process
41	1970	What Happens to Students in College?
42	1970	Queries 'N Theories: A New Instructional Game
43	1970	Learning Theory and the Teacher
44	1971	Research on College Teaching
45	1971	The Interaction Between Teacher and Student
46	1971	Grading ≠ Evaluation
48	1972	Learning Theory and the Teacher, IV. The Reinforcement Principle
50	1972	The Technology Resource for Teachers and Students
52	1973	Improving the Conditions for Learning
53	1974	Evaluation of Teaching
54	1974	The Classroom Scene: Examples of Instructional Change
55	1975	Learning How to Learn Independently
56	1975	The Extended Classroom
57	1976	Grading by Contract

Appendix A, Item 5

A LEARNED JOURNAL

VOL.2 NO.3 TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE
EARLHAM COLLEGE, RICHMOND IND. June 2, 1977

Some Aspects of Faculty Development at Earlham This Year

The chief difficulty with the term "faculty development" is that it is impossible to get any agreement on what should be included. Should the Faculty Lecture Series be included? Is directing a Foreign Study Program a reward for good behavior, or just doing one's duty, or a distraction? Rather than attempt to work any taxonomic miracles, I will tell of two workshops held here, report briefly on some work I have done as Consultant, and close with some comments on our involvement with the FIPSE National Project III.

In April, John Anderson organized an evening workshop on Working with the Skill-Deficient Student. Karl Schilling reported some work he had done with students' reading abilities. Reading rates were determined to be very low in one of his classes, and the ubiquitous yellow highlighting marker was found to be actually grafted to the hands of several students. Karl intends to do more with reading speed and comprehension in his classes. Lynn Clapham told of his testing and grading procedures which provided students with a clear concept of his expectations. John Anderson spoke of the work of Supportive Services and heard several suggestions for what could be done next year. Altogether it was a pleasant, relaxed and informative evening shared by about 15 persons.

For a description of the workshop on the use of discussions in teaching, sed the following article written by Iris Falck, one of the participants.

In the last 2 years as Consultant I have worked with faculty in a variety of ways, usually with individuals, but sometimes with small groups of three or four and once with a whole department. The initial questions fall into three categories, something involving course organization, or how to interpret student evaluations, or a request for help on lecture or discussion techniques. Once beyond the opening question, the conversations have been as varied as the teachers with whom I have spoken. Altogether, I have worked with 61 different faculty, or about half the faculty if one counts part-time teachers. The distributio over the three Divisions was about even. Over a third of the tenured faculty have ha some significant contact with me as Consultant. Am I "getting to the right people" or "consulting with those who need it?" Those are irrelevant questions. I am talking to teachers who want to work with me on their teaching, and generally we have agreed the time spent was productive.

Earlham has continued this year as one of the eleven schools participating in the FIPSE (HEW) National Project III, Elevating the Importance of Teaching. As the Associate from Earlham I have attended meetings of the Project Associates at Ann Arbor, Buffalo, Detroit and Cherry Hill, New Jersey. There were also two public meetings of National Project III, one at Bloomington, Illinois, for members of Central States Universities, Inc., and another at Orlando, Florida, as part of the program of a large faculty development conference. National Project III has also published a series of newsletters called Criteria, which deal with the evaluation, support and recognition of teaching. Titles are: Criteria I, The Scope of National Project III; Criteria II, Student Evaluation of Teaching; Criteria III, Institutional Support for Teachers; Criteria IV, Professional Development of Faculty; Criteria V, Teachers and New Arrangements for Learning; Criteria VI, Evaluation of College Teachers. Extra copies are available and may be obtained by calling ext. 319 or 309. Three further issues will appear with the final one devoted to a set of recommendations on how the importance of teaching in higher education can be enhanced. One of the consequences of the Criteria series has been a building of national interest in programs and projects on each of the eleven campuses. Earlham is no exception, and Criteria along with other sources of information has generated 109 requests for information about what is happening at Earlham. There is now a possibility that the work of National Project III will be extended in order to continue the dissemination of information.

Jerry Bakker

Discussion Workshop

After remarking that his pants aren't well pressed and that he hasn't shaved for two days, William Tell aims an arrow towards the apple on his son's head. Screams break out among the crowd when Tell's arrow misses its target and cracks open the boy's head. Learning of his son's death, Tell aims a second arrow towards the dictator and this time doesn't miss. Shortly after, he declares that he wants nothing to do with the liberation celebration, and denies being the liberator of his country.

Hero demythification is a recurring theme in an Earlham course which I am now taking. While attending the discussion workshop held at Jone's House on April 23, it occurred to me that a unique aspect of E.C. is the effort on the part of many faculty to "demythify" themselves in the classroom.

The workshop opened with consideration of various rationales behind the adoption of discussion within the classroom. Some participants suggested that faculty have responded to student desires for and expectations of the discussion style of teaching. Through her observations of our own discussion, Mary Jo Clark clarified some of the strengths and weaknesses of this approach, and as is always the case, participants spoke to varying degrees. Mary Jo stressed that one's proximity to the group leader might negatively influence the flow of conversation, and true to form, some of those closest to Jerry Bakker spoke the least. Jerry insisted that he had no intention of pursuing the role of discussion leader and only came to drop off coffee and donuts.

Student preparation was recognized as a vital element of the success of discussions and some time was spent hearing what participants did to encourage student input. (Begin class with a quiz, solicit written questions at the class' outset, etc.)

As is usually the case at such conferences, lunch provided the release for us all. Over the pork chops (thanks again Jerry), the conversation turned to the truly important issues of the day--Maine, the abundance of redbud, the abuse of the WATTS line, the need for having credit cards on a trip to Japan. (Guess who the participants were!)

The culinary delight and its ensuing discourse over, we returned to the classroom where Gordon Thompson and Doug Steeples demonstrated their own quite different styles of discussion leadership. Gordon derived input first from participants' experiences and later meshed those with the consideration of the work in question, while Doug was more formal and relied directly upon the text.

At the end of the conference, we further investigated how discussion can be implemented. Many participants might yet be seeking additional ways to demythify their roles in the classroom.

Iris Falck

Current Issues in Faculty Development--by Jerry Gaff

(The following is excerpted from the keynote address given at a conference sponsored by the ERIC Clearinghouse and the University of Florida at Orlando, Florida, March 30, 1977.)

At the onset, we should acknowledge that faculty development is not new. What is new about the professional development for faculty today is the emergence of a new conceptual paradigm that provides a different way--a richer way--of thinking about college professors than has been customary. In its simplest formulation, this paradigm holds that faculty members need more than knowledge about their subjects to be maximally effective in their work and to derive all the gratifications they might from it. It is obvious that knowledge about a field is basic to effective instruction, and colleges and universities traditionally have provided opportunities for faculty to update and broaden their knowledge through such mechanisms as the sabbatical leave, research support, and travel to scholarly meetings. But recently, many have come to realize that faculty do not live by knowledge alone.

The utility of this new approach has become widely recognized, as a large number of institutions have created new services to meet additional faculty needs. These services are many and various. They include helping faculty members become conscious of their assumptions about teaching and learning, redesign courses, acquire alternative instructional skills, gain useful feedback about their own teaching behavior, tailor their teaching to a more diverse and, in many cases, older student clientele, improve the fairness and accuracy of testing and grading, reconsider their values and attitudes about work, improve the operation of their department or institution, obtain personal renewal, and plan more systematically their careers.

If, as many of us have thought, faculty development represents a fundamental shift in thinking about the people who are professors and the institutions in which they work and offers new opportunities that supplement in important ways traditional approaches, then we must make sure that something solid remains when the fad and fluff blow away. I believe there are several things that remain to be done for this endeavor to achieve its full potential, and I'd like to suggest a few of those which, from my point of view, seem most important.

1. Perhaps the most important need for the future of faculty development is for existing programs to become firmly enmeshed in the lives of their institutions.

2. Organizational structures are important, but not sufficient for realizing the purposes of faculty development. It is what these units do to improve the quality of academic life that will determine how they are judged, not simply whether or not new structures are created.

3. Evaluations of these programs will have to be conducted. Better evidence is needed so that we can all determine whether faculty development programs are worth their cost and learn how to improve their effectiveness.

4. Administrators will have to develop greater sensitivities and skills in promoting the development of faculty in their departments or colleges. In many instances, this means an administrative development component to the program.

5. Faculty development programs, while serving individuals, ought to emphasize institutional purposes as well. After all, the welfare of faculty members is intimately tied to the welfare of the institution of which they are a part.

6. Increasing attention needs to be given to the personal aspirations and conditions of individual faculty members.

7. Students need to be brought into this enterprise more fully than heretofore. Opportunities ought to be provided for them to contribute their views and experiences to an endeavor that ostensibly is designed for their ultimate benefit.

8. A deeper view of faculty development is needed, a view that is based on a deeper understanding of human nature than now characterizes most efforts. I will venture that this deeper view of man may be derived from sources in such humanistic fields as religion, philosophy, literature and art. I believe these disciplines may be able to guide us toward to better understanding of the complexities, ironies and ambiguities in our lives and our work.

It is time to ask whether A Learned Journal ought to be continued. It is clear that some of the functions of ALJ could be served by the Faculty Newsletter and occasional memos. In fact, the appearance of ALJ has not seemed to diminish the items related to teaching and learning which have appeared in memos or the Faculty Newsletter. It is likely that the regular publication schedule of the Newsletter makes it a more reliable source. Yet it may be possible that ALJ serves a need which is not adequately met elsewhere. Hence, the reader survey which we invite or even urge you to respond to.

---------(Please tear off and return to Jerry Bakker, Box 46)--------

Yes, A Learned Journal should be continued in its present form. ______________

Continue publishing ALJ, but change it in the following way: ______________

____

____

____

I can be importuned to write for ALJ. ___________

I wish to add to my vita the title, "Editor of A Learned Journal." ___________

Name ______________________________

Appendix A, Item 6

Consultant on Teaching and Learning

I will again this year be working as Consultant on Teaching and Learning, and welcome your requests for any help you think might be useful in your teaching. For the past two years I have worked with individual teachers and with small groups on a wide variety of things ranging from style of lecturing to curricular development. I see it as my job to try to respond sympathetically to the interests and concerns of the teacher who calls on me, whether it be simply for a bibliographic reference or for extensive consultation, visitation and discussion. I am available to new faculty as well as old, tenured and non-tenured, part-time and full-time.

Any consulting work I do is kept strictly confidential. It has also been firmly established that I will not in any way be involved in the process of making faculty personnel decisions, such as on contract renewal or tenure.

If you think I can help, or if you have any questions, call me on ext. 319 or drop a note in my faculty box, #46.

Jerry Bakker

From the President's Office

This year faculty members have the opportunity of consulting with either Jerry Bakker or Dick Johnson about teaching and learning. Jerry has about half-time for this activity, Dick a little less than half-time. Consultations with both of them are confidential; their work as consultants is clearly separated from the processes of decision-making for contract renewal, tenure, and salary administration. They do not report to Faculty Affairs Committee, Student Faculty Affairs Committee, the President or the Provost that they are working with particular faculty members.

Faculty members may choose to consult with either Jerry or Dick as they wish, but the interests and focus of the two of them are somewhat different. While the distinction cannot be pushed too far, Jerry focuses on teaching and Dick on learning; Jerry on "teaching development" and Dick on "instructional development." Dick is particularly interested in utilizing the principles of human learning to improve the student's learning; while he was with the Exxon Foundation he was involved in a variety of programs testing different ways of "delivering" learning to students. But teaching and learning cannot finally be separated, so faculty should consult with either Dick or Jerry as they are led to do so.

Joe Elmore
Academic Dean

Appendix A, Item 7

September 9, 1976

Dear friend:

I assume that an Earlham teacher has to overcome some internal resistance or hesitation before calling on me as Consultant for help or just for an opportunity to talk about his or her teaching. I think it might be even more difficult to make that first move for an administrative faculty member who also teaches. Let me encourage you not to let any distinction between teaching and administrative faculty slow you down, nor should you be deterred by the fact that you teach only part time. If you think I could possibly be of any assistance to you in your teaching, do not hesitate to call on me. This letter is being sent to all administrative faculty who teach, hence the form letter. I promise that my response to any inquiry will be a little more personal. Strict confidentiality will, of course, be maintained.

Sincerely,

Jerry

Jerry Bakker

JB/sb

Appendix A, Item 8

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS 60201

THE CENTER FOR THE
TEACHING PROFESSIONS

TELEPHONE 492-3621

July 14, 1976

To: Prof. Gerald R. Bakker, Earlham College

From: B. Claude Mathis, Director
Center for the Teaching Professions
Northwestern University

Subject: Evaluation Visit, Faculty Consultant Program, Earlham College
May 11-12, 1976

On the morning of May 11, 1976, I met with Prof. Gerald Bakker of the Department of Chemistry, Earlham College, for the purpose of discussing the first year of a faculty development activity at Earlham which provides consulting services for faculty concerning the general improvement of teaching and learning at Earlham. Prof. Bakker represents the first "Consultant on Teaching and Learning," and my charge was to evaluate his performance as a consultant with faculty, evaluate the general need for the program at Earlham, and report on those observations from my interviews which relate generally to relevant issues at Earlham which could have an effect on the consultant roles assumed by faculty.

A schedule was arranged by Prof. Bakker which gave me opportunities to interview individuals on the faculty who had taken advantage of the consulting service, as well as administrators and faculty who had not been involved with the program. My report consists of three parts. The first part comments upon Prof. Bakker's role as the first faculty consultant in the program. The second part comments upon the program in general, and the third part reports some observations concerning issues which emerged during the interviews which have implications for the program.

1. Prof. Bakker's activities as a consultant on teaching and learning

Any program as sensitive as the faculty consultant program being tested at Earlham depends for its continuation upon the subtleties of style demonstrated by those who initiate these efforts. My interviews with faculty, and my discussions with the consultant, lead me to conclude that Earlham is indeed fortunate to have a faculty member with the insight and skills of Prof. Bakker as the first consultant. Prof. Bakker's activities in the faculty governance process at Earlham, together with his participation in the GLCA Faculty Development Program, give him a knowledge of the College which goes beyond his department and a reservoir of skills about teaching which permit him to approach the teaching problems of faculty from the faculty member's point-of-view. The form which Dr. Bakker has developed to introduce the consultant's role to the faculty is appropriately non-threatening and emphasizes both group experiences and individual consultation. Confidentiality is stressed and the theme is the analysis and improvement of teaching, and by implication, the educational process for students at Earlham.

I interviewed nine faculty who have used the consulting program, and who have interacted with Prof. Bakker on a wide range of problems relating to their teaching. In no instance did any of these faculty members feel negative about the program or the consultation with Jerry. These nine included both men and women faculty in a wide range of departments. A summary of their comments is as follows:

> "My consulting was a very positive experience. This school has a strong commitment to teaching, and Jerry helped me think about that."
>
> "Jerry doesn't have money to give away for projects, and this is a good thing."
>
> "Jerry is very sensitive to personal issues in his counseling. There are other faculty at Earlham who should be doing this sort of thing with their colleagues."
>
> "Jerry is an astute observer and works well with younger faculty. Does the senior faculty take advantage of the program? Probably not as much as younger faculty."
>
> "The consultant needs to be given more time by the College to enter into long-range commitments with faculty. The role of consultant should be continued, and other faculty should participate."
>
> "It was a good experience. It helped clarify my relationship to the College. Someone who doesn't know Jerry might not use him because of his being viewed as part of the 'establishment.' This would be unfortunate because Jerry is able to work with you on your terms. The program should be continued. It provides a therapeutic outlet for the faculty."
>
> " Jerry is warm and supportive. He helped me over some bad times. It's reassuring to know that someone is there even if you don't call him."
>
> "My time with Jerry was an excellent experience. My best experience as a teacher was when I worked with Jerry. I was looking for someone I could bounce ideas off of, and Jerry gave me the support I needed."

"Jerry is someone you can talk to about teaching problems without feeling embarrassed. The best thing was the support he gave me."

"Jerry doesn't always accept what you do in teaching as being right, but he is not punitive in helping you to see where you are wrong."

"I intend to maintain contact with Jerry. He handled things gently, compassionately, and supportively."

"This whole program must have impeccable integrity to succeed, and Jerry has established that as a principle, at least in his relationship with me."

"Jerry works well with faculty in all disciplines. The position is tied to the person. Jerry has a blend of personal strength that is not against the administration but also is not of the administration."

"My time with Jerry was one of the highlights of my career at Earlham thus far."

"Jerry helped me expand my horizons about teaching."

"Jerry was very helpful. Does the program have enough credibility to attract the faculty who really need help, or is Jerry useful only to support those who are already successful in their teaching? Jerry should try to extend his reach. He maintains a very good balanced objectivity in his approach to counseling."

"Jerry has promoted a realistic approach to teaching. He emphasized confidentiality. Jerry realized the difficulty of maintaining objectivity. He has not had much help in publicizing his own skills."

"If Jerry is to effective he must have some help from other faculty. The position must be defined and disseminated. Jerry should have some help. The personality creates the position, but there are other faculty at Earlham with characteristics like Jerry who could become successful counselors. They should be identified and encouraged to join the program."

"Jerry is able to identify with your problems. He is objective but involved."

"It's unusual to find a chemist with Jerry's kind of interpersonal skills."

"This effort should be continued. More senior faculty should be interested in improving their teaching."

"The evaluation system at Earlham should generate plenty of business for a faculty consultant. Jerry helped me recover from the shock of my first student reports."

In summary, the following observations are supported by comments from those faculty who had consulted with Prof. Bakker, and whom I interviewed:

(1) The consultant skills which Prof. Bakker utilizes are reinforcing, and faculty members with whom he has worked view his style of consulting quite positively. Jerry relates well with faculty in diverse disciplines. Confidentiality, sensitivity, support, objectivity, and understanding were words which were used frequently to talk about Jerry's role.

(2) Jerry's activities with faculty have been quite diverse. He has visited classes and observed a faculty member's teaching; he has helped faculty plan courses; and he has worked with faculty in helping to analyze and improve student evaluations. These activities involve multiple consulting sessions over extended periods of time. Several of the faculty interviewed extrapolated Jerry's total time commitment from the amount of time devoted in an individual instance and voiced some concern that the amount of time would infringe upon Jerry's own opportunities for professional development.

(3) Most of the faculty whom I interviewed had heard of Jerry's availability informally through conversations with other faculty. Several thought that his skills were not having the impact they deserved because of the dominance of this informal communication system about the program. This may result from their not paying attention to some of the more formal notices about consulting being available, but it does underscore the feeling of those who have met with Jerry that the experience was positive enough to motivate a wish to have the same thing happen to colleagues.

(4) Prof. Bakker will undoubtedly be a "hard act to follow" according to many of his colleagues. He has established a "tone" for the consulting service which is laudable. His own skills and insights are critical for helping other faculty have a successful beginning in the program.

2. The Program of Consultants on Teaching and Learning

The continuity of the program of teaching and learning consultants at Earlham College was supported by everyone with whom I discussed the program. This is not to imply that support among the faculty is unanimous; however, the sample I interviewed was totally supportive of a continuation. Involving faculty in a consulting relationship with colleagues can have many positive benefits, both for the consultants and their clients. On the one hand, over time, the College will begin to develop a core of faculty who are trained to analyze and recognize effective teaching in the many disciplines at Earlham. Additionally, the faculty who profit from contacts with the consultants should become more identified with the mission of of Earlham College and with the need to be continually monitoring their teaching activities. Both the consultant and the client become part of a larger support system which not only establishes expectations about excellence in teaching but also provides specific procedures for making this excellence operational

The selection of the consultant through established faculty governance procedures should be maintained. This linking of the program with faculty control should dispel any notions that the consultant is an arm of the administration and thus a part of the accountability process in the College. The ultimate success of the program depends generally upon two variables. One is the quality of faculty members who become consultants after Prof. Bakker. Maintaining the credibility and trust which he has already established is essential. The consultant must be viewed by the faculty in a non-threatening context. The second factor relates to the necessity for maintaining confidentiality in the program. Serious thought should be given to whether or not consultants should participate in any decision-making about faculty while they are consultants. My own preference would be to exclude the consultants from any kind of personnel committee during their tenure as consultants. In addition, the integrity of the consultant should be maintained by allowing the person to decline participation in faculty governance procedures even after tenure as a consultant has terminated.

If the present momentum is maintained, the problem of learning about the consultant program should take care of itself. Some concern was voiced by the persons I interviewed about acquainting faculty with the availability of a consultant on teaching and learning. Perhaps the program should be discussed both within departments and at faculty committee meetings whenever the opportunity presents itself. Eventually, most faculty will become aware of the program.

In recruiting faculty for consultant roles, attention should be given to bringing women into the network. Also, some way should be found to provide opportunities for more tenured faculty to take advantage of the consultant's time. The emphasis on the improvement of teaching may be a deterrent to participation by senior faculty. One person on the faculty might be identified whose responsibility it would be to seek out senior faculty for the purpose of initiating small group discussions of educational philosophy and other matters which might be more attractive to senior faculty. (Most senior faculty tend to feel that they have been "improved" by the process of becoming "senior.") I would not hesitate to designate as consultants some faculty whose role would be a specialized one, as long as the consultant realizes the limitations of his or her commitment. All consultants need not be generalists.

The consultant's time needs to be protected. He or she should be given sufficient released time to train for, and enter, the program. Also, some consultants may be so successful that they would see themselves remaining in the program. I feel that the consultant's formal role should be limited by a term appointment, with another appointment at a later time if appropriate. This would give the consultant an opportunity to maintain his or her academic responsibilities. Experience with the program should suggest whether a half-time assignment as a consultant is appropriate. As the number of consultants increases, it might be wise to consider a shorter term of appointment, but on a full-time basis. The longer a faculty member remains as a consultant, regardless of that person's success, the more difficult it may be to return to "home base." A successful consultant will probably continue consulting informally after his or her appointment by assuming a leadership role in a department with respect to the examination and analysis of teaching.

I sense that faculty readiness is high for the kinds of supports which can be provided by a Consultant on Teaching and Learning. The program should be continued and the administration should clearly make a long-range commitment to its continuation. The possible spread effect over a ten-year period is enormous. The dedication of Earlham College to a collegiality and openness about teaching and learning provides a splendidly nutrient culture for the network to grow and be productive in the sense of maintaining the excellence of the educational process for the students who attend Earlham.

3. General Issues Relating to a Consultant for Teaching and Learning

During my discussions with the faculty and administrators whom I interviewed about the TLC, several issues relating to the program emerged which should be taken into consideration as the program develops. One has to do with the selection of future consultants. Several faculty whom I interviewed emphasized the need to maintain faculty control over the program so that the consultant will not be viewed as part of the personnel review process. The major issue here revolves around the process which identifies and leads to the appointment of a consultant. Suggestions ranged from faculty election of the consultant to having consultants step forward and volunteer. A more realistic alternative is probably somewhere between these two suggestions. Certainly the College and its constituency should be concerned about the skills which a potential faculty member might have for making a success of the consultant's role. Not all faculty are equally ready for the role. To the extent that the Teaching-Learning Committee is viewed by the faculty as a credible part of faculty governance at Earlham College, it might have a central role in maintaining the program. The faculty should have some part in nominating persons whom they feel would make effective consultants. The more the faculty can participate in evaluating the program, the more the efforts of the consultants will be viewed as something which faculty value. The administration should not be associated with the program in any way which might suggest that consultants are part of the accountability network for decision-making about salary, retention, and/or promotion. The more evidence which the faculty can have for viewing the efforts of the consultant as their program, the greater the credibility of the consultant's efforts. The ultimate success of the program can be measured to a great extent by the degree to which senior and junior faculty with serious deficiencies in teaching competence begin to use the TLC network.

Another issue concerns whether or not the consultant should have a budget to dispense. One can argue both positively and negatively concerning the use of money as an incentive for change. One the one hand, the consultant may encounter instances where the effectiveness of teaching can be enhanced by the use of some instructional development funds. It would be very easy to allow the consultant to make judgments about the allocations of small amounts from such a fund. On the other hand, the association of the role with the allocation of support funds changes the nature of the consultant's relationship with the client. The consultant should feel that a faculty member seeks consultation because of a need for assistance and not just because of a need for money. A reasonable compromise might be for a faculty committee to control instructional development funds, with the consultant suggesting to the client when an application for support from these funds would be appropriate. The consultant might assist the faculty member in writing the application for funding.

The major issue which emerged in all of my discussions, in one form or another, has to do with the student evaluation system which seems to have created significant anxiety among faculty, especially younger faculty. Many of the consultations which Prof. Bakker has had involved some aspect of a reaction to the evaluation of teaching. Of all the topics which faculty might bring to a consultant about their teaching, evaluation seems to be the one provoking the most reluctance to share. In discussing this issue with younger non-tenured faculty, I was impressed by the differing perceptions which were offered about the evaluation system. Some view it as a way of justifying personnel decisions which have already been made. Some see student evaluation as a "stress test" and a "puberty rite" whose function is to "separate and weed out" rather than help and improve. Some felt that the system was helpful; others felt that it was divisive. For whatever reason, the anxiety, in my opinion, is real, and it results in an unwillingness to discuss evaluations with a consultant and/or colleagues. The evaluation procedures are viewed as a threat rather than a support. Part of this anxiety may result from the anticipated uncertainties which younger faculty have about their future. The evaluation procedures represent a reasonable target for this "free-floating" anxiety. Some of these feelings, however, may be justified when one considers the image which Earlham College has for those who seek positions there. Earlham is known as an open, collegial environment in which one can pursue individual interests within the general parameters of a commitment to the goals of liberal education. The image is of an academic environment in which one competes with one's self rather than with others. The potential for "becoming" has a high value in determining individual effectiveness, as opposed to an emphasis on immediate evidence of having "become." To this extent, student evaluations of teaching should provide evidence of directions for further development rather than evidence of comparisons of the extent of development at a fixed point in time in relation to colleagues. Much of the anxiety I sensed in my interviews may result from the discontinuity which younger faculty feel when their non-competitive expectations are suddenly confronted by an evaluation system which suggests competitive comparisons. Most faculty members seek higher education as a non-competitive environment for self-expression. Quantitative evaluation, particularly of teachers by students, leads to competitive expectations and a change in the nature of academic environments. For whatever reasons, the evaluation system at Earlham seems to be a concern worth noting.

4. Summary of recommendations

(1) The Program of Consultants on Teaching and Learning at Earlham College should be continued, and the administration should provide for its continuation by budgeting released time and other supports for these efforts in future commitments to the academic program.

(2) The TLC program should be planned by the faculty and designed so that faculty members view it as an effort which benefits them.

(3) Prof. Bakker's model for consulting should become the basis for establishing the traditions and expectations necessary to make the Teaching-Learning Consultant a continuing part of institutional efforts at Earlham.

(4) Faculty and administrators should be sensitive to the kinds of issues which the consultant program can identify and which can be dealt with generally before collegiality and trust have been eroded within the College. Student evaluation of teaching appears to be one such issue at present.

ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF TENURED FACULTY

In an effort to give credence to Earlham's claim to be a college where excellence of teaching can be found, and in an effort directed solely toward maintaining and advancing competence of teaching among its tenured faculty, the faculty affirms that each tenured member of the faculty shall undergo an assessment every five years until he shall have attained the age of 60.

The assessment is not designed to question the competence of any faculty member to hold tenure and implies no change in current College policies regarding removal of tenure, as stated in the faculty handbook, nor any lessening of the College's adherence to the A.A.U.P. Statement of Principles. In particular, no materials gathered specifically for use in the assessment procedure can be introduced as evidence in any proceeding to remove tenure.

While a schedule of assessments will be established by the Academic Dean, faculty members will have the right to request evaluation at differing times from those scheduled if this is appropriate because of their plans for sabbatical leaves or other forms of professional development. The assessment will be carried out as stated below.

A. The Assessment

1. Early in the year in which assessment is to occur the faculty member and the Academic Dean will have a short conference to work out specific details of the assessment. They will determine the membership of a committee of three (to include representation from FAC) who will make a final reading and evaluation of the dossier. The Dean and faculty member will also reach agreement on the students and colleagues from whom letters will be requested.

2. A dossier will be collected. Ordinarily it should contain the following:

   a. A self evaluation. This is probably the most important document in the file, and it is assumed that the faculty member will devote considerable thought to its preparation. While it could review past accomplishments and weaknesses, it should be primarily forward locking with a detailed statement of the member's professional and personal plans, aspirations, and needs for the following five years.

   b. Student evaluation forms. Faculty members are urged to develop alternatives to the standard form if they wish and to develop additional forms if they feel this would be appropriate.

(Over)

2. contd.

   c. Letters from present and former students.

   d. Letters from faculty colleagues, both inside and outside the department.

   e. Additional documentation considered relevant. This might well include course outlines or syllabi, copies of publications, summaries of meetings attended, and the like.

3. During the fall term the committee will consult and work with faculty member being assessed, hopefully on a fairly regular basis. Informal discussions with the faculty member, individual visitation of his classes if this is mutually agreeable, and consultation on the preparation of the self-evaluation should ease the tension of such an assessment and should give committee members far greater insight into the faculty member's performance than could be obtained by only reading the dossier. Early in the second term the committee will weigh the results of their consultations and the materials in the dossier and will forward a written report to the Dean accompanied by the dossier. The member being evaluated will receive a copy of this report.

B. The Follow Up and Development

After reading the file and taking into consideration the comments of the committee of three, the Dean will confer with the faculty member to determine ways in which the College can contribute in the following years to the growth and development of the member. Presumably this will include discussion of sabbatical and other leave plans, the possible commitment of special development funds to the member, and the like. If it seems appropriate, the faculty member will be urged to seek the help of the Coordinator of Teaching and Learning or of any other faculty member or group of members in a program designed to improve teaching performance.

Appendix B, Item 2

Decision-Making Process for Decisions on Teaching Faculty

The President of the College bears final responsibility for faculty personnel decisions, but that responsibility is exercised within a system of shared authority through advice from, consultation with, and consensus-seeking with the Provost and Academic Dean, the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Student Faculty Affairs Committee, and the department (and program where appropriate) with which a faculty member is associated. Each of these individuals or groups brings a perspective and a judgment to faculty personnel decisions which can contribute to making the wisest decisions. While the process of advising, consulting, and seeking consensus takes time, the process is justified for the following reasons:

1. **Better decisions are more likely to be made;**
2. **Higher morale and greater engagement and identification with the College are more likely to be the result;**
3. **Collegiality and community can be increased;**
4. **The system is consistent with the Quaker identity of the College; and**
5. **The process has educational value.**

While it is recognized that there are times when officers of the College must make personnel decisions quickly and without the benefit of the usual process, it is understood that such times should be infrequent and extraordinary and that the officers should explain the reasons for their action to the appropriate persons and groups as soon as possible.

Appointments

1. Names of candidates can come from anyone in the College; ordinarily the department or program is the primary source. Openings will be advertised in publications appropriate for the position.

2. Candidates' dossiers (vita, transcripts, reference letters) will be secured. Telephone calls to appropriate persons may be made to secure more information about candidates.

3. The Provost and Academic Dean will approve all invitations to candidates to come to campus for an interview. The interview process will usually occupy two days and ordinarily will involve a presentation by the candidate. Candidates will usually be interviewed by the President, the Provost and Academic Dean, the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Student Faculty Affairs Committee, faculty members in the department, and a group of students closely related to the department.

4. The decision to offer a position to a candidate by the President (or when he is away from campus by the Provost and Academic Dean) will be made after advice from, consultation with, and seeking consensus with the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Student Faculty Affairs Committee, and the department involved. Though achieving consensus is the aim, primarily because such agreement on action gives confidence that a good decision has been made, when consensus is not possible, the President must judge the "weight" of the advice he has received.

Contract Renewal

1. The following evaluative material will be collected about each faculty member under consideration for renewal of contract:

   a. A self-evaluation

   b. Evaluation and recommendation by the department (and program where appropriate). The department's recommendation will include, whenever possible, assessments based upon faculty observation and consultation with student majors. The evidence upon which assessments are based will be stated in the recommendation. Departments are urged to establish a program of class visitation so that information is regularly available for both evaluation and improvement. The recommendation will be made available to the faculty member under consideration and the member may submit comments for the file if he or she chooses.

   c. Letters from a minimum of six students, chosen by the faculty member in consultation with the chairperson of the department. The subject of the letters will not read the letters.

   d. Computer print-outs of the evaluation results of all the courses taught by the faculty member at Earlham.

   e. The faculty member has the option of selecting one or more faculty colleagues outside the department to write letters of evaluation.

   f. The faculty member may submit any other information he judges will be useful in evaluating his or her work.

2. These materials will be read by the President, the Provost and Academic Dean, the Faculty Affairs Committee, and the Student Faculty Affairs Committee. If their judgment disagrees with the department's recommendation, there will be a discussion with the department or representatives of the department. If their assessment of the teaching effectiveness of the faculty member differs critically from that of the department and if the faculty member consents, the department chairperson (or other appropriate person) will have access to the student evaluation data so that informed discussion and an attempt at consensus can proceed.

3. Final responsibility for the decision rests with the President, but with the advice, consultation, and consensus-seeking as outlined above.

4. Following the evaluation process for renewal of the contract immediately preceding consideration for tenure (usually during one's fourth year at Earlham), the faculty member will be informed of any questions which appear at that time to be relevant to the tenure decision.

Tenure

1. The following evaluation material will be collected about each faculty member under consideration for tenure:

   a. A self-evaluation

   b. Evaluation and recommendation by the department (and program where appropriate). The department's recommendation will include, whenever possible, assessments based upon faculty observations and consultation with student majors. The evidence upon which assessments are based will be stated in the recommendation. Departments are urged to establish a program of class visitation so that information is regularly available for both evaluation and improvement. The recommendation will be made available to the faculty member under consideration and the member may submit comments for the file if he or she chooses.

c. Letters from a minimum of six students, chosen by the faculty member in consultation with the chairperson of the department. The subject of the letters will not read the letters.

d. Computer print-outs of the evaluation results of all the courses taught by the faculty member at Earlham.

e. The faculty member has the option of selecting one or more faculty colleagues outside the department to write letters of evaluation.

f. The faculty member may submit any other information he judges will be useful in evaluating his or her work.

2. These materials will be read by the President, the Provost and Academic Dean, the Faculty Affairs Committee, and the Student Faculty Affairs Committee. If their judgment disagrees with the department's recommendation, there will be a discussion with the department or representatives of the department. If their assessment of the teaching effectiveness of the faculty member differs critically from that of the department and if the faculty member consents, the department chairperson (or other appropriate person) will have access to the student evluation data so that informed discussion and an attempt at consensus can proceed.

3. Final responsibility for the decision rests with the President, but with the advice, consultation, and consensus-seeking as outlined above.

4. A faculty member who has been denied tenure may appeal to the Clerk of the Faculty if he thinks there has been a violation of due process (that is, if he judges the procedure to have been unfair, prejudiced or incomplete). The Clerk will conduct an examination of the process; if in his judgment there is evidence of a violation of due process, he will refer the case to the President for reconsideration, with suggestions for correction of the violation of due process. The Clerk cannot make a judgment on the substance of the decision but only on the process.

Appendix B, Item 3

Criteria for Appointment, Contract Renewal, and Tenure

Earlham College

While no statement can fully describe the qualities valued in present and prospective teaching faculty members at Earlham College, a general set of guidelines can be of use, for two groups in particular. First, younger faculty members need to be apprised of the nature of the criteria which will be applied to their records in considering initial appointment, contract renewal and tenure. Second, the administrative officers, advisory committees and college community at large need a single, articulated set of guidelines in order to strive for equitable and reasonable judgments.

These guidelines are not a checklist. The weight of different qualities will vary in each individual. The evidence upon which evaluation is based will also vary. Some modes of expression of valued qualities are not mentioned here. These criteria do not describe any one individual. Heterogeneity is one of the strengths of a faculty; the criteria are not to be interpreted in such a way as to stultify that heterogeneity. Just as faculty must be free to develop their own personal styles, so those making administrative judgments must live under the advice of the Elders of Balby Friends Meeting in 1956:

> "...these things we do not lay upon you as a rule or form to walk by, but that all, with the measure of light that is pure and holy, may be guided: and so in the light walking and abiding, these may be fulfilled in the Spirit, not in the letter, for the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life."

1. Teaching effectiveness

Teaching effectiveness is the most important of the four criteria which cannot be compensated for by excellence in other areas. Such effectiveness can be determined in various ways, including, but not limited to, the following:

a. A very strong rating as evaluated by:
   1) Students, through course evaluations, letters and enrollments;
   2) The faculty member's department, based on visits in class, observation of students who have studied with the instructor, team teaching and other collaborations;
   3) Other faculty colleagues, specifying their basis for evaluation;
   4) Alumni, through direct communications, visits on return to campus, and their own records as graduates;
   5) College administrators, making responsible use of reports from students and faculty.

b. Interest and involvement in the diagnosis and improvement of one's own teaching practices. Creative and appropriate innovations may be indicators of this involvement.

c. Competence in and knowledge of one's subject matter, as judged by peers on and off campus.

d. Capacity to promote student learning beyond the classroom, through the quality of relations with students outside of class hours. At times, this may appropriately include evaluation of the faculty member as an adult role model, taking into consideration the plurality of valued roles.

e. Integrity and fairness as a teaching professional. Standards for student achievement in classes should be reasonable, clearly communicated, and equitably applied, insofar as generally perceived by students and faculty.

2. Quality of Mind

Quality of mind involves a complex judgment, particularly by peers, based on concrete experience and evidence. Some indications of the quality of mind here intended include the following:

a. Intellectual vitality and sharpness, as reflected in continuing study, research and creative work. One indicator of this may be regular involvement in professional and educational societies and other organizations.

b. Imagination and analytical skill, perceptiveness and clarity as shown in daily work and experienced by students and colleagues.

c. Breadth of interests and competencies, the demonstrated capacity to place knowledge and skills into significant contexts.

d. Strongly indicated potential for growth, giving reasonable assurance that the faculty member will remain intellectually alert and alive.

3. Contributions to the community

While valued contributions to the community may take many forms, the following may be those most frequently observed:

a. Constructive participation in college governance, especially faculty meetings and committees.

b. Helpful and generally supportive relations with faculty colleagues, so as to enhance the results achieved in departments and other joint programs.

c. Advising and counseling of students beyond immediate academic contexts.

d. Participation in various programs of college life outside the classroom, such as art, drama, music, recreation and athletics, lectures, convocations, teas, religious and social gatherings.

e. Imagination, ingenuity and energy in the conception and support of new programs.

4. Congruence with the institutional identity of Earlham

Earlham's identity is rooted in tradition, but that tradition includes the capacity to develop new visions of value and purpose. Congruence may thus be defined in the following general ways:

a. Understanding of and support for the basic commitments of the College, its nature as a Quaker institution, the liberal arts character of its curriculum, and the primacy of teaching and learning.

b. Capacity to live and work constructively within Earlham's system of governance, derived from the patterns of Quaker consensus.

c. The reflection in one's life and daily relationships of values which complement and enrich the values and purposes advocated by Earlham.

Appendix B, Item 4

July, 1975
Office of Evaluative Studies

Faculty Opinions on the Teaching Evaluation Survey

Summary of Principal Findings

1. The two open-end items of the survey instrument--calling for written comments by students--drew substantially more expressions of support than the numerical-rating items.

2. Numerical-rating items varied considerably in their acceptability to the faculty. The most frequently voiced objections to the ones disliked concerned: apparent irrelevance to classroom teaching; questions of the competence of students to make judgments on certain matters; the view that the items elicit student responses to personality or popularity rather than effectiveness in teaching; and certain technical aspects of the items.

3. The evaluation form is more frequently judged useful by faculty as a means of ascertaining where one stands in the estimation of students than as a means of gaining understanding about one's teaching. However, 62 percent of the respondents said the survey had been of at least moderate aid toward understanding more clearly some things about their teaching.

4. Most faculty view the survey results as having had moderate or little influence on their teaching--newer faculty attributing to it more influence than older faculty.

5. There was widespread expression of lack of information and uneasiness concerning the use made of teacher evaluation survey information by Administrators, FAC, and Student FAC.

6. A majority (64 percent) of respondents said they were in general accord with the idea of teacher evaluation surveys--though it was clear that there were many reservations about specifics of the survey form and procedures. Twenty percent said they were not in accord.

* * * * *

Having been the targets of evaluative ratings by students for some seven terms, teaching members of the faculty were asked in Term III of 1975 to complete a questionnaire on their views of the teaching-evaluation process. Questionnaire forms were sent to 110 people, 61 of whom (55 percent) completed and returned them. In relation to length of service at Earlham and tenure, the distribution of respondents was as follows:

22	First or second year at Earlham
14	Untenured; beyond second year at Earlham
25	Tenured
61	

While all items of the questionnaire to faculty were of the "objective" type, comments were invited and came forth abundantly. Though only sketchily summarized in this report, they provide a wide range of views and suggestions on teaching evaluation, not to mention expressions of mood ranging from restrained but earnest approval to the clarion, resonant snort. The reader interested in further inquiry into this project is warmly encouraged to examine them in this office.

Results of the questionnaire to faculty are summarized below in the order of items on the questionnaire form which faculty members completed.

A. Respondents were asked concerning each item of the survey form filled out by students, "Are you satisfied with this item for use in teaching evaluation surveys?"

Two open-end questions are presented first in the survey form:

"I. How has the instructor helped you to learn more effectively the material presented in the course?

"II. What might the instructor do to help students in future courses to learn the material more effectively?"

"Yes" (i.e., I'm satisfied) responses were 85% for the first and 82% for the second. These were the highest proportions of favorable responses among all the items on the questionnaire to faculty. Nine comments were offered on these items, seven of which called them the most useful part of the survey form.

The sixteen multiple-choice items fared variously. Only one of them ("Presents subject matter clearly") drew over 70% "yes" responses, viz., 74%. Six others received over 60% "yes" replies. One item received fewer than 50% "yes" replies: "Is valued for advice not directly related to the course" had approval from only 29% of the respondents and elicited a deluge of critical comments--chiefly to the effect that it is irrelevant to the evaluation of classroom teaching. Others at the lower end of the approval scale, with corresponding "yes" percentages, were:

15. Furthers development of students' self-confidence and personal growth (51%)
8. Enjoys classroom teaching (52%)
16. ". . . the instructor's teaching effectiveness . . ." (52%)
4. Selects interesting materials and readings within the field (54%
5. Has helped students to learn thoroughly and systematically (54%)

General themes prominent in criticisms of the multiple-choice items were:

1) This approach tends to promote a contest of popularity or personality.
2) I doubt the competence of students to make valid judgments on a number of the items.
3) The form of presentation tends to encourage snap judgments.
4) The spacing of the numbers to be circled is inappropriate.
5) Some of the items are less well suited for some courses than for others.
6) Many student raters do not know enough professors to have a sound basis for comparison.

Seventy-five percent of the respondents offered at least some comment on this section of the questionnaire, usually on three to six of the items.

B. A two-part item inquired to what extent the respondent had "found the information from teaching surveys useful: a) as an aid toward understanding more clearly some things about your teaching (i.e., as a diagnostic aid); and b) as an aid to knowing in general where your teaching stands in the estimate of students."

The distribution of responses (in frequencies, not percent) for four levels of usefulness were as follows:

	a) Diagnostic aid	b) Estimation of students
A considerable extent	7	16
A moderate extent	31	35
Little	18	8
None	5	2

Evidently more people found the survey useful as a guide to how their teaching is estimated by students than as an aid to understanding better their efforts as teachers. However, the 38 who attributed considerable or moderate diagnostic aid to the survey are 62 percent of all respondents.

Only three comments were offered on this item--but then, no "Comments" space was provided.

C. "To what extent have your teaching practices been influenced by information from course evaluation surveys?"

Fifty-one faculty members responded to this question. Their answers (in frequencies, not percentages) were distributed as follows

	1st & 2nd year	2 yrs. plus, nontenured	Tenured	Total
To a considerable extent	3	1	1	5
To a moderate extent	11	7	4	22
Little	7	5	8	20
None	1	1	2	4
	22	14	15	51

Some contrast between first- and second-year faculty as against tenured faculty shows up here--the newer faculty indicating more influence from surveys than do tenured teachers. But in no category is "considerable" often chosen as the degree of influence.

D. "Do you think the present survey form applies sufficiently to the adjudged quality of the course as distinguished from the adjudged quality of certain aspects of the teaching?"

Forty-four of the 56 respondents to the item circled "No," three "Yes," none "?". Thirty-eight people offered comments, of which the more frequent were, paraphrased:

1) This is an unclear and inept question.
2) The two elements are simply inextricable.
3) The questionnaire slights course evaluation, and this is a mistake.
4) Different aspects of the course need to be evaluated separately.
5) A single questionnaire cannot apply aptly to all courses.
6) The questionnaire is too much a personality/popularity rating.

"Are you content with the kind of statistical information that has been provided with teaching evaluation reports?"

Half said "Yes"; a third said "No"; the rest were uncertain. The longer at Earlham, the greater the tendency to indicate acceptance.

Comments came from 21 people. The most frequent remark was:

1) Written comments from students are more useful than statistical information.

Others offered by more than one person were:

2) The statistics are okay as long as you recognize their considerable limitations.
3) I don't understand statistics.
4) Statistics are too much emphasized.

Some suggestions were that separate norms be provided for:

Really large classes;
First- and second-year teachers;
Courses of homogeneous subject and kind of setup.

"Are you satisfied that course evaluation information has been treated with due regard to confidentiality?"

Forty-none said "Yes," three said "No," seven were uncertain. Eleven comments came forth, five of which said the writer didn't value confidentiality anyhow. Two of the five said they would explicitly prefer open information.

"Are you content with what has been done (as you understand it) with teaching evaluation information by: a) Administrators? b) Faculty Affairs Committee? c) Student FAC?"

For each category of users, the answers were approximately 40% "Yes," 40% "No," 20% uncertain. This pattern was consistent for all three categories of faculty.

The question elicited comments from 24 people. The prevalent themes of these were lack of knowledge about just how the information is used and some apprehension that some misuse--especially, over-reliance on survey data--may occur. Three comments were mildly supportive.

H. "Are you in general accord with the idea of teaching evaluation surveys as they have been conducted at Earlham during the last two years?"

Thirty-nine--64% of all respondents--said "Yes"; 13 (20%) said "No". Seven were undecided; three did not answer.

Among 25 comments offered, the thoughts most frequently expressed were:

1) The idea has merit but the execution has shortcomings.
2) I have little or no confidence in it.
3) It is all right if used with due regard to its limitations.
4) It is a start, and we should keep trying.

But the diversity of expressions was great, and many other points were put forth.

I. "How frequently do you think it desirable that teaching evaluation surveys be conducted for faculty in each category?"

This item was answered somewhat less frequently than any other, with totals of 48, 47, and 51 respondents respectively for the three categories of faculty. Two or three people remarked that they were not completing it because they were not in sympathy with the survey activity. The largest incidence of non-respondents occurred among tenured faculty.

Responses were distributed as follows:

Respondent Category	1st or 2nd year at EC			2nd yr. plus Untenured			Tenured			Totals		
Category to be surveyed	1-2 yr.	2nd plus	Ten.	1-2 yr.	2nd plus	Ten.	1-2 yr.	2nd plus	Ten.	1-2 yr.	2nd plus	Ten.
Every course, or nearly so	15	13	12	11	8	6	11	3	4	37	24	22
About 50-75% of courses	4	5	4	0	4	2	2	8	4	6	17	10
A third of courses	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	5	3	3	7
One or two courses a year	0	1	3	0	0	1	0	2	4	0	3	8
Less than one course a year	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	4
	20	20	20	12	12	12	16	15	19	48	47	51

J. "Would you use more evaluation forms of your own devising if there were no College-run survey covering your courses?"

Forty-three said "Yes," eight each "No" and uncertain. Among 22 comments, the ideas most frequently expressed were:

1) I do use them and would use them.
2) Due to laziness, probably not.
3) There is advantage in having a form explicitly designed for one course.
4) I prefer written evaluative statements by students.

Appendix B, Item 5

Opinions on the Faculty Evaluation Process
by People Who Were Evaluated

Office of Evaluative Studies
August 1976
James McDowell

I. Introduction

Earlham faculty members go through an evaluation process when contracts are up for renewal, when a tenure decision is to be made, or —for tenured faculty—when it becomes time for a periodic five-year evaluation. In 1975-76 the question was raised, how do the people evaluated view this process? This report summarizes a questionnaire survey designed in response to that question.

The questionnaire was sent in the spring term to 18 faculty members who had been evaluated for contract renewal decisions. Replies, after one follow-up, were received from nine people, or 50 percent of the total group. Eight of the nine—identified by return forms separate from their questionnaire forms—had had their contracts renewed; one had not. All of the non-responders had received contract renewal. Thus, the people from whom we received replies were fairly typical with respect to contract renewal status. How representative they were in other respects is an open question.

A summary of replies to each of the seven items of the questionnaire follows. Responses to the first two items may perhaps be taken as a mini-summary of the entire survey. A more detailed summary of replies to the questions is then presented. As an appendix, I have indulged in a statement of impressions and comments derived from my work with this material. I trust the reader will be free to supplement or replace it by his/her own reflections.

II. Summary of replies to questions

Question 1. From your point of view, what were the good (favorable, helpful) aspects of the procedure?

Insofar as the process was found helpful, the respondents:

a) Received useful feedback—from students, colleagues, Joe Elmore
b) Achieved some clarification, perspective;
c) Got some support, encouragement.

Comment: Both the number of aspects considered helpful and the expressions of benefits realized were modest and restrained, but seemingly significant.

Question 2. What aspects of the process do you view unfavorably in the light of your experience?

Dissatisfaction with the process had principally to do with:

a) Sense that some of the information used was not satisfactory or was not evaluated in an appropriate way;

b) Sense of uncertainty about:
   1) What was going on in the evaluation process;
   2) What was expected of a good teacher;

c) Anxieties and discomforts in relationships aroused by the process.

Question 3. If not covered above, please indicate any ways in which the evaluation process has led to changes in your teaching.

Such changes as were reported entailed:

a) Gaining insight and re-directing efforts;
b) Use of varying resources by different people: student evaluations; colleagues; teaching consultant; Dean;
c) Turning attention away from evaluation and relaxing.

Question 4. Has the process affected your personal growth in any other ways (e.g., in clarification of goals, values, plans, or self-understanding; orientation toward the College and toward your work; relationships with others)?

Five people said they achieved some self-understanding or clarification of goals or priorities. Two said they revised their orientation toward the situation in some way.

Question 5. Do you think the process was harmful to you in any way(s)?

Three out of nine thought the process was harmful;

Five thought the process resulted in strain or loss of trust in relations with colleagues;

One thought student ratings resulted in confusion on his/her part;

One thought it "not harmful personally but I wouldn't want my friends to have to go through it."

Question 6. Do you think the process was fair in your case?

Five said they considered it fair;

Two gave tangential comments;

One said, "Don't know"; One did not respond.

Question 7. Other comments

Six made no comment.

Comments made, in essence, were:

a) The process is time-consuming; frustratingly repetitive for those on one-year contracts.

b) I would much prefer an open hearing....

c) This procedure has got to become more humane....alienation of faculty who feel subjected to undue stress....dearth of supportive assistance, only casual recognition of strengths....

III. Replies to questions: Further details & analysis

1. Favorable aspects of evaluation process

a) Sources cited:

Self-evaluations (3)
Summary and overview by Joe Elmore (2)
Visits (to classes?) by department member, followed by discussion (1)
Departmental review of student ratings, & feedback from department (1)
Student ratings (1)
"All items except student quantitative ratings" (1)

b) Benefits cited:

"While Earlham was evaluating me, I was evaluating Earlham. We reached a mutual decision about each other."
"Some further clarification of one's strengths and weaknesses as a teacher."
"Chance to review, consider priorities."
(Self evaluation): "Helpful in crystallizing own thoughts and in communicating with the administration"
"Sense that people involved were trying to be careful, decent, helpful"

2. Unfavorable aspects of evaluation process

Student ratings, and/or the way they are presumably used (4)
Sense of secrecy, unclarity about procedures, uncertainty about purposes or "weightings" of different elements in the process (4)
Should be more specific about expectations, dimension on which judged (4)
"..decisions and evaluation made by persons who don't have the faintest idea what it is I do" (1)
Anxiety relating to classroom, students (1)
Anxiety, sense of competition relating to colleagues (1)
Assumption that certain elements are under-weighted or over-weighted (1)
Self-evaluation not helpful, destructive (1)
Departmental evaluation not sufficiently helpful (1)
The process ought to be more public. At least, one ought to have those judged excellent teachers as role models. (1)
Would like more feedback from department. (1)

3. Changes in teaching ensuing from evaluation process

Source	Outcome
I got to ignoring the evaluation process.	Teaching improved.

Source	Outcome
Post-decision conference	Clearer assessment of performance relative to expectation; easier to address weaknesses
Student evaluations	Indicated difficulties (but not diagnostic)
Consultation with J. Bakker	Recognized need to maintain reasonable work load
Discussion with colleagues (not evaluation process)	
Having colleagues visit classes	
	Know I won't be kept on; relaxed (not much change)
	More aware of problem of busyness; attempting to budget time more effectively
	Helped me assess effectiveness of various approaches I have used; several changes.

4. Personal growth ensuing from evaluation process?

"There is a distinct tone of competition among younger faculty Evaluation perhaps, not the cause but does nothing to alleviate it."

"No, but I learned adopting certain strategies would be helpful to a newcomer to Earlham....a very small, ingrown community."

"Understanding of strength and weaknesses as teacher--mainly, from the new evaluation form..."

"Self-understanding. Orientation toward college/work. Relationships with others (unfortunately increased paranoia)"

"No."

"Clarifying goals and values to some extent. Self-evaluation helpful in re-evaluating priorities and plans for future."

"Yes; in crystallizing thoughts, enhancing self-confidence, clarifying goals and plans."

"Yes; increased self-understanding; I discovered I could withstand this kind of pressure, and I discovered that I disliked it intensely."

"Not greatly."

5. Was the process harmful in any way?

"Not personally, but I wouldn't want my friends to have to go through it."

Deleterious effect on relations with others; less open, honest, carefree.

"This evaluation came too late for really effective use. It damaged my self-image. It convinced me I had not been receiving honest feedback from my colleagues."

"Harmful only in increased tension."

"No."

"Can't see any."

"Yes. Marked strain on relations between colleagues and me... Came to see many colleagues as evaluating rather than supporting."

"Yes. First year's student evaluations were critical without being diagnostic, often inconsistent from one class to another. Lack of diagnostic information made it difficult to plan improvements and created unnecessary and destructive despair."

6. Do you think the process was fair in your case?

Two said "Yes"; one said "reasonably," one, "Don't know."

"Fair, yes; helpful, No."

"I'm not even sure what the process was."

"Critical evaluation reached me too late...Feel I did not receive honest feedback from colleagues; didn't realize this until talk with Joe. Mixed effects: stimulating challenge; enjoying evaluation-supported change in teaching style. But what I'm doing is too late; damaged self-image; destructively sensitive to interaction with colleagues....My orientation is now toward colleague evaluation...last year I was oriented to student evaluation....This questionnaire has served as an interim self-evaluation..."

7. Other comments

(All were presented in initial summary)

Appendix: Compiler's Impressions and Comments

We can focus on two major dimensions of the evaluation process and its outcomes of personal change and development. One is confrontation with the external side: the array of questions, information, and judgments put by other people, and the sharp challenge of the total situation. Our respondents on the whole found this fair - though not pleasant. The other dimension is engagement with one's personal side in context of the formal evaluation: the appraising of one's own strengths and deficiencies, the reviewing of goals and relative values, the pondering of current and possible directions of movement. Favorable developmental outcomes seem to have been associated with an active and constructively-oriented engagement in this dimension.

Being evaluated is evidently a taxing, lonely business for a considerable proportion of those who experienced it. It sometimes shakes trust in relationships that earlier had been counted upon, especially those with departmental colleagues. Can measures be taken to enhance the supportive role of departmental colleagues, while maintaining their function as participants in evaluation? This has the aspect of a challenge with no uniform or foolproof solution but a continuing need to be dealt with.

Presence of the teaching consultant provides an informed, sympathetic, experienced source exempt from the competitive and judgmental hazards to which departmental relationships are prone, and at least some of those evaluated had taken advantage of this. Perhaps the teaching consultant can provide, among other services, an earlier, informal equivalent of the Dean's post-decision interview, found distinctly valuable by at least some of our respondents.

I am not sure what to make of the few comments that raised questions about "weightings." Possibly an open statement on this topic might be helpful--either to say that there is no uniform rule about it, or to offer some guides to such uniformity as there is.

Results of the questionnaire seem to me to support warmly the value of small-group activities and one-to-one helping arrangements outside the formal evaluation process which aim toward improvement of teaching--especially those that entail the use of feedback processes and the consideration of feedback data with the assistance of unbiased, sympathetic colleagues. To offer continuing encouragement to such groups--without pushing them beyond the point of welcome--and to develop widespread, flexible skills in arranging and conducting them appear to be desirable goals for the faculty as a whole.

Appendix B, Item 6

Course______________________________**Instructor**_________________**Term**_____**Date**__________

INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION FORM

The Faculty Affairs Committee, Student Faculty Affairs Committee, President and Academic Dean will use the information that you provide below in making important decisions about this faculty member, including contract renewal and tenure. Your comments will be read by the faculty member, but every effort will be made to preserve your anonymity.

STRENGTHS:

WEAKNESSES:

COMMENTS & SUGGESTIONS:

OVERALL PERFORMANCE:

I believe this instructor's performance in this class shows her or him to be

Among the BEST at E.C.			**Average for E.C.**		**Below average for E.C.**	
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**

App. B Item 7

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION, SUPPORT, AND RECOGNITION OF COLLEGE TEACHERS

A SPECIAL PUBLICATION OF THE FUND ASSOCIATES IN NATIONAL PROJECT III, PREPARED AT THE CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON LEARNING AND TEACHING, THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Number VI May, 1977

Evaluation of College Teachers

This paper will discuss the evaluation of teaching and teachers, primarily for the purpose of salary, promotion, and retention decisions. It will overlap somewhat with Criteria II which was concerned with evaluation by students, both for this purpose and for the related—but different—purpose of providing information to the professor for use in improving instruction. In considering student ratings here, we focus on the administrative purpose, i.e., to assist in pay, promotion, and retention decisions.[1]

Although student ratings can be important, they are not sufficient for administrative evaluation; therefore, we will also give considerable attention to evaluation of faculty by their peers.

Institutional reward structures differ significantly in the relative importance assigned to excellence in teaching and to excellence in research. Many institutions, especially the community colleges and the liberal arts colleges, give first weight to teaching, in fact as well as in what they profess. Others, especially those that profess equal concern for the great triumvirate of teaching, research, and service are often perceived by the faculty as, in fact, making various indices of scholarship and creativity the only ones that really matter. This is quite understandable on at least two counts: (1) Society's rewards for institutions, for departments, and for individuals come primarily through activities that can gain public recognition and evaluation, even if that "public" consists only of professional peers; (2) Institutions which have this means of evaluation available to them are more comfortable with it than with the more sensitive (and possibly more abrasive) evaluations that need to be made of the process of teaching. Furthermore, there is no evidence that institutions which reward primarily on the basis of research prominence provide better or worse instruction than those which reward primarily on the basis of instructional excellence. One might therefore erroneously conclude that success in research is highly related to success in teaching. It is not.

Nevertheless, our position is that institutions of every variety would be well served by adopting and maintaining a system for evaluating teaching proficiency. Such systems need to be developed so that the parties involved regard them as sensitive, impartial, and practical to maintain. Their goal should be to recognize directly the status of superior accomplishments in teaching and to reflect this recognition in official statements regarding its status.

Whatever the system, the first essential is to make it generally known and understood. Institutions should make as explicit as possible the criteria upon which administrative decisions will be made. Institutional styles of governance differ, but we recommend that the criteria be developed and agreed upon by discussion and negotiation among the parties concerned. These criteria should allow for individual differences within faculties to the extent that such differences are consistent with the unit and institutional mission and values. In general, too, it is best to develop criteria within the smallest practical unit. "The smallest practical unit" in some cases may be the whole institution, but frequently it will be a unit like a department or a group of departments perceiving themselves as being essentially similar. In any case, the unit ought to be explicitly defined and given responsibility for developing evaluation methods and criteria agreeable to its members. One reason for this is that different disciplines often require different methods and criteria for evaluation. Beyond this, the credibility and acceptability of such systems require that faculty members have a strong hand in their development. To insure compatibility within the system, standards adopted at each level will need to be reviewed, understood, and accepted by the next higher level.

There remains, of course, the problem of how to document excellence in teaching. Several generalizations seem relevant. One is that it is probably fruitless to search for easily applied criteria or for a single set of criteria that will be applicable to every case. This is unfortunate but need not be daunting. Teaching is such a significant part of our institutional mission that it deserves the effort that will have to go into recognizing it.

Secondly, since such evidence as can be gathered is likely to be partial and incomplete, each piece of evidence probably will need to be considered in relation to the whole. Thus, for example, student ratings need to be considered in light of peer opinions, characteristics of courses which were taught, and so on.

Thirdly, these proposals may make the job of promotion committees harder, although not really different, than it is now for those committees that normally pay little attention to teaching. Such promotion committees have always had to deal with information on scholarship, research, and creative artistry from evidence that is partial and incomplete; they have had to judge and weigh that evidence. These proposals imply that faculty members and administrators making decisions about promotion and tenure should expect to put as much care and sensitivity into the interpretation of information about teaching as they do into considering other evidence of scholarship upon which such decisions are made.

---

[1] Evaluation has at least two purposes which sometimes cannot be (and perhaps should not be) wholly separated. One purpose is for recognition and reward; the other is for personal growth and improvement. (In some situations a third purpose might be added—to provide information for "consumers," i.e., students.) If a faculty has the objectivity, mutual trust and self-confidence needed in order to use evaluation for both reward and growth in mutually supportive ways, this is ideal. However, it is probable that those purposes will more often be accomplished better if they are kept separate.

While we deal here mainly with proposals for evaluating classroom and other direct instruction, distinguished contributions to teaching can also be found in such teaching-related activities as out-of-class instruction, instructional and curricular development, instructional research, and advising. Distinction in any of these areas may be the unusual case, but where it occurs it should be recognized, and poor performance in any of these activities should be weighted negatively.

Direct Instruction

Our discussion of direct instruction will be concerned mainly with **factors to be considered** in evaluating direct instruction and will not at this time give much attention to **how to obtain or systematize** that information. A great deal of work is needed in these matters, especially as it relates to information supplied by faculty peers. Faculties will need to consider not only the relevance of the criteria suggested but also how to collect and systematize the data in their situation.

The most commonly available systematic source of information is questionnaires administered to students about instruction and instructors. Less often used, but fully as important, other types of evaluative information will be discussed later under the categories of: (1) Instructor's own statement of his or her teaching objectives and significant teaching activities; (2) Instructional materials; (3) Evaluation and grading methods; and (4) Instructor attributes.

We believe that students are an important source of information about teaching and that questionnaires are a valuable means of eliciting some kinds of information. We recognize, however, that there are problems and dilemmas with respect to using student questionnaire responses in administrative decision-making. These are discussed below.

Student Ratings

First, some assumptions or generalizations about student ratings: (1) Students can generally judge reliably how satisfactory an instructor and course have been for them.[2] (2) Students are not qualified to judge matters requiring professional background, e.g., whether the material presented is current, whether it is placed at the proper level of difficulty, whether it is properly integrated with the curriculum as a whole, or whether the instructor's evaluation procedures are appropriate and technically adequate. (3) Standardized questionnaires are not useful in evaluating all kinds of instructors. In particular they have generally been of only limited value in studio courses, clinical practice, self-paced courses, team teaching, and individualized instruction.

Given the above assumptions, a number of problems in the use of student evaluations may be unsolvable if one requires near perfect solutions. However, the dilemmas are far from insurmountable when questionnaire results are used with care and understanding. In fact, we observe something of a contradiction in the way faculty members consider different kinds of information used for evaluative purposes. They tend to accept the usual evidence of scholarship, such as publications, even though very little is known about the implied validity, reliability, freedom from bias, and comparability of such evidence. However, many are highly critical of similar "softness" in student ratings and may for this reason discount them altogether.

The better posture is to understand the limitations inherent in student ratings and then subject that data, also, to the interpretive and judgmental process which is customarily applied to the more usual evidence of scholarship.

Some of the most persistent questions and doubts about the usefulness of student questionnaires seem to center on the following issues.

The Different Purposes for Student Evaluation Questionnaires

Student evaluations are used for two main purposes—diagnostic (i.e., for self-improvement) and administrative (for pay and promotion considerations).[3] These purposes are not necessarily compatible. (Much of the problem with course evaluation questionnaires has stemmed from expecting them to serve both purposes well.) The information that faculty members need in order to help improve their instruction usually is specific to their courses, their intentions, and their students. There is no reason to suppose that what one instructor wants to know or will find useful will be the same for other instructors. Conceivably, for this "formative" (improvement) purpose, a unique set of questions could be prepared for every course. Several systems now exist which can provide such flexibility. Typically, they are computer-aided and they allow instructors to select perhaps 30 or 40 rating items from a large and varied item "pool" and, in effect, to create tailor-made rating instruments. Such systems are now in use or under development at several dozen institutions, including Purdue, The University of Michigan, University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, University of Alabama at Birmingham, and the University of Illinois.

For administrative purposes, "summative" evaluation is more appropriate. In this instance, "common" measures are needed since it is necessary to compare faculty members. Some highly generalized questions are most useful since they tend to be equally applicable across a wide range of courses. Such questions can be quite simple, such as:

Rate the course content.
Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness.
Rate the overall value of the course to you.
Rate the amount you have learned in this course.

Questions such as these tend to be highly reliable[4] and we recommend that this type appear on every questionnaire which is intended for administrative use. Such questions are not very helpful to the instructor seeking self-improvement hints, but that is not their purpose. Some institutions already have normative data on thousands of sections for these kinds of general questions.

---

[2] For example, analysis of University of Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire data shows that the majority of CEQ **subscale** reliabilities for class sections are greater than .65 which is an acceptable level of reliability. The CEQ **total** score yields a much larger proportion of class section reliabilities, about .65. Similar data are reported by other institutions for similar questionnaires.

[3] As mentioned previously, there is frequently a third purpose—namely to provide information to prospective students.

[4] Reliability in this case refers to class sections mean reliability over a large number of classes. The general range of reliability for each of these items is from .80 to .94. Other investigators report similar reliabilities for similar items.

Aside from the fact that the two purposes require different kinds of questions, their basic incompatibility is suggested by the personal meaning they have for the faculty member. Under "improvement" conditions, participation is usually voluntary, feedback is confidential, and the participant's motivation is to become more effective. Administrative use is much more threatening: participation is usually required, feedback goes to the individual's superior, and such crucial matters as salary, retention, or promotion will be affected by the results. Only the rare faculty member can view the same instrument as a "friendly advisor" and as a determiner of his or her professional future.

Validity

It is reasonable to ask, "If the questionnaire purports to measure teaching effectiveness, does it?" The question is deceptively simple. It implies that some measurable, independent, generally agreed upon outside criteria exist where in fact they do not. It is quite impossible to get academics to agree on a general formulation of what constitutes teaching effectiveness, and perhaps there is no reason why they should. What is applicable in one case need not be at all applicable in another.

Instead, we suggest that the results of student evaluation questionnaires be looked upon as answering a somewhat different question, namely, "To what extent do students **think** that this instruction was effective?" We believe that this is a meaningful and important question in considering faculty merit and that student evaluation questionnaires can provide a reliable answer to it. The general feelings of satisfaction and success which students gain from their courses constitute one dimension of effective teaching. While high student ratings do not guarantee that the teacher is effective, it will be a rare teacher who is truly effective and still receives low student ratings.

Norms

Absolute scores, such as a number or a description on a scale, are difficult to interpret unless one knows how other people are distributed on the same scale. Here we are faced with a dilemma: Who are the others? What is the norm base? On most campuses, norms have generally been developed from faculty members who have elected to have their courses evaluated and, therefore, those norms may not be representative of the faculty as a whole.

In addition, there are problems of norming which seek to take into account variables such as class size, whether the course was required or elective, grade distribution, and level. However, general items such as those on page two tend to be less sensitive to these kinds of variations than are more specific items.

To overcome the more common weaknesses of existing norms, it is frequently suggested that student evaluations be made mandatory in all courses for all instructors. But before this seemingly simple remedy is adopted, its full implications, and alternatives to it, should be exained. First, for many institutions, full faculty cooperation with such mandatory schemes is practically impossible. At times, cooperation may appear to be given when in fact only perfunctory implementation is achieved. Thus, the quality of the norm base may not improve, even though the accumulated numbers become larger.

Three additional considerations may recommend against full, mandatory use of student valuations: cost, faculty morale or rapport, and student tolerance. Costs can be unexpectedly high since, conservatively, each student's evaluation of a course will cost the institution 15¢ and, more realistically, it will cost twice that amount—or even more. Thus, multiplied over all students in all courses during each semester or term, annual costs can reach well into the thousands of dollars. Do the benefits justify such expense? Faculty morale and rapport with faculty can also suffer—especially if faculty are required to use an evaluation form that is common to all courses and, as a result, not very sensitive to the characteristics of some. ("Why do they persist in asking about the quality of my lab teaching when there is no lab?" or "Why don't they ask about the required readings, which are the heart of the course, rather than the textbook, which I know is inadequate?") In addition, student tolerance may be exceeded if each student must evaluate courses and instructors four to six times each semester. Although hard evidence is lacking on this, it is at least plausible that students who must repeatedly evaluate courses will lose interest in giving careful attention to the task. Obviously, for evaluations to be useful, they should represent judgments reached with much thought and care, so conditions conducive to this need to be maintained.

Thus, there are several potentially serious problems associated with total and mandatory use of student course evaluation procedures. Consequently, it is recommended that institutions develop some sampling procedure which is feasible under local circumstances and which strives to include all appropriate courses and instructors from time to time. Voluntary participation for whatever reason should, of course, be encouraged, but beyond that the plan should seek coverage of courses and instructors which is broadly representative but which remains sensitive to matters of data quality, cost, faculty morale, and student tolerance.

Other Kinds and Sources of Information

We have said that student ratings are an important but not sufficient source of information about instruction. One needs corollary data, in part to provide information which students are unlikely to have or to be able to make good judgments about, and in part to provide checks of internal consistency or explanations for perceived inconsistency. This kind of information, usually obtained from one's peers, is as important and requires collection procedures as systematic as for evaluations from the students.[5] As a general framework, we suggest direct instruction be evaluated on the basis of the following categories:

Instructor's own statement of teaching objectives and significant teaching activities
Instructional materials
Evaluation and grading methods
Instructor attributes

---

[5] It is perhaps unfortunate that relatively little work has been reported on the systematic collection of information from former students—those who have graduated and can make judgments from the perspective of greater experiences and maturity than current students.

These four categories are not mutually exclusive or exhaustive, and certainly not all would necessarily be present in any given classroom setting. The outline of subcategories contains questions which might be asked in the evaluation of instruction.

Instructor's Own Statement of Teaching Objectives and Significant Teaching Activities

This category asks the instructor to reflect on significant teaching activities. The intent is to explore a dimension often overlooked: that is, of what in the teaching performance is the instructor most proud—and is this consistent with the data collected from other sources? Data in this category might consist of the instructor's written response to brief, open-ended, written inquiry. It provides the instructor with the opportunity to explain strategies, objectives, or circumstances which made his or her effort unique. Was a particularly difficult objective being emphasized? Were facilities and equipment adequate? Were new approaches explored? Was there an important outcome which would not be observed through other appraisal procedures?

Is the statement consistent with other collected data? Is it reflective of weaknesses that appear in other forms of evaluation? Does it offer suggestions for self-improvement pegged to an appropriate future time schedule? Does it offer significant reasons to explain contradictory information obtained elsewhere?

Instructional Materials

The concern is with characteristics that describe the content of the course. Some of the characteristics to be judged and some guiding questions are given below.

- Textbooks, Handouts, and Syllabi
  Are they current, relevant, suitable to the course outline? Have new or creative teaching aids been developed or explored? Are they of a difficulty and quality appropriate to the course level?
- Lecture Notes
  Do they follow the course outline? Are they well organized, individually and as a sequence? Do they supplement (or needlessly duplicate) the text and other class materials?
- Reading and Reference Lists
  Do these supplement the lecture notes and class discussion? Are they up-to-date? Do they "challenge" the student?
- Non-reading Assignments
  Are sample problems and laboratory reports adequately presented to broaden the students? Are the projects coordinated with the rest of the syllabus material?
- Statements of Objectives
  Do these fit in with the overall departmental objectives? Has the instructor been able and willing to extend the usefulness of the course by integrating it with others which may have come before or will come later?

Evaluation and Grading Methods

Even though evaluation procedures interact with both instructional materials and instructor attributes, it is possible to make inferences about teaching quality by reviewing the formal evaluation process. Under this category we include: prompt and useful feedback from tests, clarity of test objectives, relationship of exams to objectives and other instructional materials, reliability and validity of tests or other measures of student achievement, fairness of grades, and rationale for grade distribution and for grading policy. Although the judgment of colleagues is of most importance, student comments should be obtained also.

- Examinations, Tests, and Quizzes
  Do they appear to be fair? Is the grading objective? Are thought questions blended with tests of memory? Are tests returned promptly and wrong answers explained? Do the grades follow a distribution pattern that is acceptable? Is there evidence that most students are achieving objectives?
- Student Projects
  Are they a relevant learning experience or simply "busy" work? Do they fit within the course objectives? Do they help solve a problem? Do they better prepare the student for life beyond the classroom?
- Grading
  On what standards is it based? Do the students know the standards? Is the grading fair?

Instructor Attributes[6]

The concern here is with less tangible aspects of in-class instruction and includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Instructor Knowledge
  Although recognized as a prerequisite to effective instruction, substantive expertise is not necessarily a permanent attribute. Evidence that the faculty member has conscientiously kept up in the discipline and extended his or her own skills and understanding is thus relevant to teaching effectiveness. Likewise, if the instructor is responsible for instruction in areas outside his or her specialty, evidence that the necessary expertise has been acquired should be sought.
- Method of Instruction
  This refers to the preparation of the instructor for class and the development of systematic procedures for facilitating learning. Specific characteristics may include the following: presents material clearly, stimulates questions in class, uses class time efficiently, presents relevant examples, stresses important materials, changes methods to meet new situations, helps students gain new viewpoints and appreciation, leaves students feeling that class effort is worthwhile, and increases students' skills in thinking. In obtaining evaluative information on this topic, it is reasonable to assume that colleagues and administrators may be adequate judges of appropriateness of methods but students may make useful judgments on the effectiveness (outcomes) of different methods.
- Concern and Enthusiasm for Teaching
  The instructor's enthusiasm for teaching includes willingness to teach and to take a personal interest in the improvement of his or her own teaching. Specific concerns include commitment to the field of study, efforts to improve course quality, analysis of previous experiences, experimentation with new ways of teaching, search to improve quality of student achievement, demonstration of interest in material.

---

[6] It will be evident that one way to observe the behaviors described in this section is by visiting the classrooms of those being evaluated. In fact, this appears to be a relatively common procedure, especially on the part of administrative officers who use it as a primary evaluation method. Classroom visitation can be useful but it must be recognized that it is accompanied by severe problems of sampling, rater bias, and rater unreliability.

suggesting appropriate readings, relating course content to recent developments in the field, and interacting with colleagues on matters related to teaching and its improvement. Both colleagues and students can appropriately share in the evaluation of this area. Judgments of effectiveness should be tempered by consideration of the number of classes and students met, the number of different courses taught (and therefore preparation time and breadth required), and the difficulty of effectively teaching the courses assigned.

- Relations With Students
  The concern here is for instructor interaction with individual students. The instructor should strive to establish relationships with students that will promote student learning, maintain congenial relationships with students, and sensitize the teacher to student needs. Displays of courtesy and interest are also relevant; e.g., keeping appointments, relating positively to students, giving consideration to student suggestions, helping students having difficulty, and being fair and impartial in dealing with students. For evaluative information on this aspect, students probably should have the major input, though colleagues can often observe relevant behavior.
- Peer Evaluation of Scholarly Quality
  How do the individual's peers evaluate his or her knowledge, communication skills, and enthusiasm on the basis of performance in colloquia or seminars which the peers attend?

Out-of-Class Instruction

Academic Advising

Here we are concerned primarily with thesis guidance, supervision of individualized study and supervision of graduate students in research projects. Is the faculty member an effective resource person and mentor? How do the person's peers evaluate the quality of his or her students' work? Their defense of their work?

Instructional and Curricular Development

It is desirable to recognize leadership in formulating and developing a curriculum (usually a committee activity) or a course. Contributions meriting a positive evaluation include a superior reconceptualization of content, a beyond-the-ordinary marriage of content to method, or the development of an unusually successful textbook. Too often the creativity and effort which go into the development of new and better ways of teaching go relatively unnoticed and unrewarded. Innovative teaching and instructional strategies which produce demonstrably superior results should be as obviously encouraged as other noteworthy professional accomplishments. See **Criteria V** for a more detailed account of these contributions.

Instructional Research

Some faculty members conduct systematic studies related to the teaching of the subject matter in their discipline. Some departments would weigh published research of this kind heavily under the general rubric of research and scholarship, but others would not. Those departments might be more comfortable with considering such research not as a contribution to the discipline but as a contribution to teaching.

Personal Advising

There are two major qualities of the effective advisor: "interest" in students and "competence" as an advisor. The former can be inferred by observing such things as courtesy and warmth in interacting with students, the frequency with which advisees seek assistance on other than routine matters, conscientiousness in keeping appointments, or ability to call students by their first names (or to remember special things about them—hometown, hobbies, etc.)

Competence can be inferred by avoidance of enrollment errors; knowledge of rules, regulations, and procedures; soundness of advice regarding options and opportunities; use and appropriateness of referral sources.

Frequently, colleagues can judge some of these matters. Routine surveys of advisees (majors) can also provide helpful input.

Summary

We have reiterated not only the importance of teaching in higher education—an importance which most doubtless take for granted—but the importance also of explicitly recognizing teacher competence within an institution's formal reward structure. This is not easy to do, but we believe it can be done if faculty colleagues approach the task with the same sensitivity and the same recognition of complexity and richness which is generally involved in the valuation of scholarly credentials. An analogy might be to liken the promotion committee to a group of skilled musicians. They are already good at reading that part of the score pertaining to scholarship; they need to develop and bring that same expertise to interpreting the credentials which can be brought to bear on teaching.

Bibliography

Bergquist, W. H. and Phillips, S. R. **A handbook for faculty development.** Washington, D.C.: The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1975.

Centra, J. A. **Strategies for improving college teaching.** Prepared by ERIC Clearinghouse. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, December 1972.

Doyle, K. O., Jr. **Student evaluation of instruction.** Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1975.

Eble, K. E. **The recognition and evaluation of teaching.** Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors, 1971.

French-Lazovik, Grace. **Evaluation of college teaching guidelines for summative and formative procedures.** Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, undated.

Gage, N. L. "Student ratings of college teaching: Their justification and proper use." In Allen, Melnik, and Peele (Eds.), **Reform renewal reward.** Amherst, MA: Clinic to Improve University Teaching, University of Massachusetts, 1975. Pp. 121-135.

Kulik, J. A. and McKeachie, W. J. "The evaluation of teachers in higher education." In F. N. Kerlinger (Ed.), **Review of Research in Education,** Vol. 3. Itaska, IL: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1975.

Miller, R. I. **Evaluating faculty performance.** San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1972.

Miller, R. I. **Developing programs for faculty evaluation.** San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

Pace, C. R. **Evaluating learning and teaching.** San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

Seldin, P. **How colleges evaluate professors.** New York: Blythe-Pennington, 1975.

This report was written by Charles J. McIntyre with assistance from Warren Seibert and Richard Owens. Based on a report by the Committee on Teaching and Service of the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. SCE.

Activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Fund and no official endorsement by that agency should be inferred.

For information about back file copies or multiple copies of the **Criteria** series, please write to Janet Lawrence, Assistant Director, National Project III, Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, The University of Michigan, 109 E. Madison, Ann Arbor, MI 48109

For further information about local activities in National Project III, write to:

Ball State University, 2000 University Ave., IN 47306—Project Director: Jerry J. Nisbet, Coordinator of University Evaluations

Bucknell University, Lewisburg, PA 17837—Project Director: Wendell I. Smith, Provost

Burlington County College, Pemberton-Brown Mills Road, Pemberton, NJ 08068—Project Director: Lee L. Schroeder, Director of Measurement and Evaluation

Earlham College, National Road West, Richmond, IN 47374—Project Director: Gerald R. Bakker, Department of Chemistry

University of Illinois, 205 S. Goodwin, Urbana, IL 61801—Project Director: Charles J. McIntyre, Director, Office of Instructional Resources

The University of Michigan, 109 E. Madison, Ann Arbor, MI 48109—Project Director: Stanford C. Ericksen, Center for Research on Learning and Teaching

Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, OH 43015—Project Director: Stephen C. Scholl, Dean of Educational Services

Purdue University, ENAD, Room 402, West Lafayette, IN 47907—Project Director: Warren Seibert, Director, Office of Instructional Services, Measurement and Research Center

State University of New York Central Administration, 99 Washington Ave., Albany, NY 12246—Project Director: Charles B. Neff, Assistant Chancellor for Special Projects

State University of New York, Oswego, Oswego, NY 13216—Project Director: David J. King, Dean for Evaluation and Research

---

Center for Research on Learning and Teaching
FIPSE Project
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Non-Profit
Organization
US Postage
PAID
Ann Arbor, MI
Permit No. 144

Designed by
University Publications
The University of Michigan

Appendix C, Item 1

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUND

GUIDELINES

The Professional Development Committee has set the following deadlines for the submission of proposals for funds for professional development. The Committee will accept proposals up until February 1, 1977 for activity to be engaged in during the summer of 1977, and through the 1977-78 academic year. We will call again for proposals for activity to be engaged in during the 1977-78 academic year with a deadline of May 1, 1977.

The fund totals $60,000 in 1976-77 and the same amount in 1977-78.

Proposals may be submitted by any member of the administrative faculty or teaching faculty.

The Committee will use the following guidelines in awarding funds:

1) A proposal must indicate how it will contribute to the professional and personal development of the administrative or teaching faculty member, and how it will provide the means by which the faculty member may become a more effective member of the Earlham community.

2) Grants will not generally be made from this fund for the support of administrative or teaching duties which are a regular part of the faculty member's responsibilities.

3) Grants will be available to individual faculty or to small groups of faculty for a variety of activities. The following list is meant to stimulate your thinking, not to limit it:

   a. preparing interdisciplinary courses.
   b. preparing various programs...
   c. improving skills...
   d. developing a competence...
   e. improving an area...
   f. facilitating the 5-year plans...
   g. pursuing research and scholarship.

4) The amount requested may be based either on a stipend of $1,000.00 for full-time work over a term or a summer, or on an itemized budget. In some cases, variations or continuations of these methods may be appropriate.

5) In most cases, applicants should discuss their proposals with the academic dean and/or faculty colleagues.

6) Proposals must be made in writing (5 copies) and should include the following:

- a. A description of the nature of the project and how it will benefit the faculty member and the College.
- b. A statement of the costs of the project and how these costs will be met.

Recipients of grants will be expected to give the Committee a report on their activities at the conclusion of the grant. The report should include, at a minimum, 1) a clear statement of the objectives of the activity and the ways the objectives have been achieved; and 2) a statement of the contribution the activity made to one's development as an Earlham faculty member.

Any member of the Committee will be glad to answer questions and/or receive suggestions about the work of the Committee.

John Anderson, Administrative Faculty
Vernie Davis, Social Science Division
Joe Elmore, Chairperson
Ray Hively, Natural Science Division
Dan Meerson, Humanities Division

Appendix C, Item 2

A LEARNED JOURNAL

VOL. NO. TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE
EARLHAM COLLEGE, RICHMOND IND.

1 2 January 30, 1976

A ROSE BY ANY OTHER...

No longer "the asterisk", we have a name! And we thank all our participants in the hot contest to name this newsletter. We decided that after one issue we can no longer take refuge in Sir Thomas Browne's assurance "To be nameless in worthy deeds exceeds an infamous history". We now have a history and thus may as well acquire a name too.

The choice was a difficult one. Jerry Bakker led off setting what, in retrospect, was to be a high-water mark of erudition with "Lamentations of Lazarus", "Theophrastus' Logarythmic Cacaphony", The Elements of Ecclesiasticus" and "Siderious Nuncius". David Weening brought us down to what turned out to be the lowest common denominator with his suggestions "Bride of Faculty Newsletter", and " Blazing Teaching". Paul Lacey, clearly in the Weening school, contributed, among others, "The Learning by Doing, Blues, News" and "The ~~Trial~~ and Error..../The Trial and ~~Punishm~~.../The Trial and Error News".

But what hurt was his offering as viable "The Sow's Ear".

Egotism had a brief flurry with (from Jerry Bakker) "Jerry's Jottings", "Bakker's Dozen" and "Smith's Smatherings". But humility was evidenced too when Jim Kennedy, who's fond of acronyms, offered, for second prize "Collaborative Reflections About Pedagogy".

Jim's first prize suggestion? Also with an eye to acronym, "Toward New Teaching", which moves closer to some of the sober names, "TLC Newsletter", "A Learning Place", "Teaching Tattler" (Bakker), "The Earlham College Teaching and Learning Report" (G. Boone), "Better Learning" (G. Silver), and the informative "This Newsletter is About Teaching" (Lacey).

Our thanks go to George Silver, the only participant to classify his submissions for the ease of the committee. He had all 19 of his entries divided into four categories: Not much zip ("Learning"), More zip ("Chatauquas on Learning"), Too much zip? ("Do it Better") and other fanciful proposals ("Student-Teacher Synergy"). We award George the the Dewey Decimal button for the new year.

The coveted highest award, however, goes to Paul Lacey for his entry: " 'A Learned Journal' so that people who cite it can say, I read it in a learned journal, and people who write for it can say they have been published in a learned journal." It reeks motivation and his prize is an autographed copy of Erickson's book "Motivation for Learning: A Guide for the Teacher of the Young Adult," will be arriving in a plain brown wrapper.

The judges' decision is irrevocable.

Bonnie Frick

Need of Higher Education

Teachers have a difficult time keeping up with the literature in their subject field, few attempt to keep abreast of the literature of higher education in addition. Yet an eye cast regularly over a few key sources will go far to keeping information current. The following is a briefly annotated list of some of the most important newspapers and journals to be scanned for news of the higher education field.

The first can be a key to all the rest as well as to much, much more.

> CAPSULES: A REVIEW OF HIGHER EDUCATION NEWS AND RESEARCH: published every 2 weeks, this presents a bibliography of recent journal articles listed in 3 graduated stages: full abstracts of current articles, a brief listing by subject of the articles, and briefest of all, a listing of those articles of most import. (Kept in faculty lounge.)

For quick news the following two are invaluable.

> CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION: a weekly newspaper packed with news articles, published for most of the academic year. Particularly useful are the section on the status of legislation, a "fact file" or directory of information difficult to find elsewhere and the book reviews. Classified ads announce job openings. (Kept in faculty lounge.)

HIGHER EDUCATION AND NATIONAL AFFAIRS: (American Council on Education): an 8-page weekly newsletter giving short squibs on the latest news in the politics of higher education. Lists significant new publications and announces major grants and awards. (Kept in faculty lounge.)

For a longer, slower look we recommend

CHANGE: THE MAGAZINE OF HIGHER LEARNING (Educational Change Inc.): a monthly look at the changing scene of American higher education. Articles, reports, editorials and book reviews. Articles are substantial and written by scholars and practitioners in the field. (Shelved with periodicals.)

and

THE JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION (American Association of Higher Education and the Ohio State University Press): issued bi-monthly JHE offers scholarly articles on administrative and professional issues (e.g. "Faculty Bargaining Associations" and "Size of University Classes and Student Evaluations of Teaching"), and signed critical book reviews. (Shelved with periodicals.)

Bonnie Frick

GLCA Faculty Fellow Project in Teaching History

The advantages of an inductive approach to the study of history are easy to discover. As students proceed through the careful study of primary documents to progressively higher levels of conclusion, they can escape the illusion that historical knowledge consists in a body of fixed data. In their freedom they can recognize the active character of historical understanding. The inductive approach used in History 11-12 offerings introduces students to history as a mode of questioning which defines the human experience in time. This approach also encourages critical study of texts and usually brings about a noticeable improvement in reading and writing.

These advantages are considerable, but they have usually been realized only in fairly topical courses. That is, inasmuch as induction seems superior to mere chronological coverage, it may also seem a logical alternative to attempt at a comprehensive survey of the human past. This implication is unfortunate because it denies to students an architectonic sense of the human past which still effects them. It is easy to maintain that the benefits induction confers outweigh the costs just listed, but is equally arguable that a well-constructed survey can and should yoke the inductive approach for its own purposes.

I applied for GLCA Faculty Development funds with that possibility in mind, and made it the governing presupposition in constructing History 31-32-33: "Individual, State and Society in the West I-II-III."

The sequence consists of three courses which may be taken singly: History 31 treats the long period from the ancient river civilizations through the rise of Christianity; History 32 deals with topics in medieval and early modern European History; History 33 examines Europe from the Enlightenment to the present. To achieve clarity of focus, the subject matter of all three terms is the development of patterns and perceptions of political and social authority. The courses are appropriate both for students with special interests in European History and cognate fields, and for general students who need to satisfy the second term of the history requirement or wish an elective course in history. The combination of induction and coverage has helped it perform these somewhat diverse tasks.

Unlike many courses offering History 12 credit, courses in the sequence use secondary readings and lectures both for background and to offer models for organizing data. Unlike many survey courses elsewhere, however, students read large quantities of primary documentation in order to induce major questions of interpretation. Only after such inductive examination of a body of source material do they read interpretive literature or hear lectures on the subject. In History 32, for example, they will read portions of Einhard's Charlemagne, several Carolingian capitularies, and the Song of Roland before receiving any external instruction on the subject. In the term just ended, I found the discussions and papers on the sources to be of a generally high level and I found that students responded well to readings and lectures which were, in effect, responses to their own research. It is through this complementary use of primary and secondary evidence that the combination of induction and coverage occurs.

Bob Southard

Review: Teaching, Learning, and the Mind: by Young Pai (University of Missouri at Kansas City), Houghton-Mifflin Co., Boston, 1973.

A broad analysis of the concept of "mind" as used in several theoretical approaches to teaching and learning forms the heart of this well organized book. The reader is led by Professor Pai as he ambitiously embarks upon a critical examination of the formal discipline, apperception, behavioristic, and cognitive theories of teaching and learning. While such a journey would appear to promise little but headaches, the author seems to have captured pros and cons of each in a most refreshing and straightforward manner.

Certainly, the interested teacher is well served by this constructive, critical analysis of maligned as well as praised approaches to the dissemination of knowledge.

The book is not intended to serve as a "how to" volume of teaching skills, but it certainly places in focus a number of the major past and present views of learning theory and - more specifically - teaching theory. Although the behavioristic section is overloaded toward the more radical behaviorism of B.F. "Inductive Leap" Skinner, excellent treatment is given to cognitive theories now emerging from empirically oriented psychological approaches. Only treatment of behavior flow or information processing models could have improved coverage of that area. Equally useful is the historical perspective given in the section on the formal discipline approach with regard to later changes in educational thought.

While the depth of coverage is sufficient for one desiring comparisons or suggestions covering the several approaches, excellent bibliographies are also provided for those more advanced or more curious. Good use of passages from original writings also adds clarity and insight concerning theoretical views less well known by the reader.

The reader may also be stimulated by the ongoing discussion of the mind-body problem which runs throughout the book with appropriate input from the several theories. This discussion ranges from the substantive mind through bundle and identity theories and winds up with a treatment of the functional view of mind. Mercifully, one is not subjected to the author's bias (as is so often the case with questions such as this) but is instead given the opportunity to make up his own 'mind' according to his educated preference.

As you are now aware, this reviewer enjoyed the book and gained a great deal of knowledge from the organized and interesting approach used by Pai. I certainly recommend it to anyone interested in theoretical approaches to teaching and learning.

Dan Wrather

What's Coming Next?

To avoid pressing them publicly, I will not name those who have promised to write short articles for "A Learned Journal". But I can assure you we have some interesting reports coming. What would you like to contribute? This newsletter is for us alone. What you write need not be long or polished to the deep glow of old silver. Feel free to tell us of your pleasures in teaching, your difficulties, your frustrations. Let's share what we are thinking and doing about teaching.

Jerry Bakker

Appendix C, Item 3

A LEARNED JOURNAL

TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE
VOL. 1 NO: 3 EARLHAM COLLEGE, RICHMOND IND. March 29, 1976

BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION AT EARLHAM

Recently I agreed to interview a few prospective freshmen for the Admissions Office. As a result of that decision I have been led, perhaps earlier than otherwise, to ponder the question: what makes Earlham College better than other places? What does Earlham have that other four-year liberal arts colleges don't have? My answers wandered far afield, from a Quaker tradition to an equestrian program. But in my brief time on this campus I have come to the view that one of the most important things Earlham has that other institutions lack is Evan Farber. This opinion has been shared so widely and for so long, of course, that it has long since assumed the quality of an objective truth. The existence of this truth was confirmed once again, however, on the last day of January when a group of Farber's Friends gathered in Jones House to share their views concerning the nature and future of bibliographical instruction at Earlham. (The depth of their loyalty can be gauged when one reflects that the last day of January was a Saturday!)

During the morning session we pondered the place of bibliographical instruction in a liberal arts education, and quickly (for a newcomer like me) the extent of Evan's influence became apparent. As we began, Len Clark centered our attention upon the essential rather than the ancillary relationship of the library to the classroom. That such an observation was greeted with the respect due an established truth is eloquent testimony to the distance Earlham has come in developing an idea which still falls upon stony soil at most institutions of higher learning.

As if to underline the truth of the observation, Jerry Woolpy summarized his excellent paper describing the development of a collaborative and integrated bibliographical instruction in introductory biology. The general biology course moves beyond the tradition of classical education - classroom, lecture, textbook - with the systematic use of guided library exercises and programmed materials, reinforced by course examinations which require the use of new-found skills of information retrieval. Through these means, the course serves, in Jerry's words, to extend "the boundary conditions of knowledge" of students in a field which, more than most, is characterised by rapidly expanding information and rapidly changing assumptions.

In the course of the discussion which followed, it quickly became apparent that not all of the disciplines represented had been able to develop the relationship between library and classroom to the degree which the biologists had. It was pointed out that some of the assumptions of "essentiality" can be accepted in some fields more readily than in others. Some approaches to knowledge rely upon experiences which can be enhanced only in limited ways by bibliographical instruction. Len Holvik's observation that a student can produce a good formal paper on Beethoven's music based entirely on research in the written word without having heard a note of the Great One's music struck me as illustrative of the problem as perceived by the arts in particular.

As others voiced their own experiences with library instruction, a subtle range of possibilities was revealed. Each of us, I suppose, shared Hal Hanes's experience of "brain-storming" as the words of colleagues sparked renewed speculations concerning his or her own field of teaching. Our discussion of the uses of bibliographical instruction in particular courses served to make us more immediately aware of the view shared by Len Clark and Jerry Woolpy that in our various disciplines we are more concerned to teach different "ways of knowing", different patterns and habits of thought and investigation, than merely different bodies of substantive information. The interdisciplinary exchange was helpful in making us more alert to one another's problems and in making the librarians more aware of the variety of ways in which the disciplines approach the relation of method to substance.

In the afternoon session, the workshop discussed possibilities for encouraging additional use of bibliographical instruction at Earlham. Among the suggestions was a plea for more systematic interaction between teaching faculty and librarians at the planning stage of course development, interaction on a personal, departmental, or divisional level. The preparation of an overall plan for such instruction by the library staff to make systematic what had been episodic was another related suggestion to encourage ways to bring the librarian's tools of access to bear on specific courses and course projects.

The need is clearly for each to educate the other in the possibilities available. The importance of working to this end was demonstrated by the workshop discussion and seems to boil down to this: a working familiarity with the use of the library can serve to achieve one of the most basic purposes of a liberal arts college - it can truly "liberate" the student to be a self-starter. Bibliographical instruction, when it is accomplished in the context of a substantive academic program and is done with practical rather than with mere formal ends in mind, really frees the student by awakening her or him to the possibilities of the scholarly task. The feeling of achievement when one comes across a gem of information obtained only because one knew where to look is in a very real sense its own reward.

Bob Johnstone

(Editor's note: Farber's Friends is an unchartered but actively proselytizing group. The initiation fee is a written or verbal request of an Earlham librarian for help in building library use into any course at Earlham. Membership is lifetime. For further information call on Tom, Jim, Phil, Leo, Hal, or even Evan himself.)

Bob's generous comments and thoughtful evaluations are very much appreciated. But I must note that our accomplishments would have been minimal without the cooperation and support of so many members of the Earlham community, both faculty and administration. I don't know of any other institutions where one would hear teaching faculty talking about "the essential rather than ancillary relationship of the library to the classroom" or about the importance of teaching different "ways of knowing", using bibliographic instruction as one teaching method.

It seems to me the next developments we should look toward are: 1) relating bibliographic instruction to those courses or areas not making adequate use of it now; 2) developing assignments and course objectives that will require students to apply evaluative criteria and critical analyses to the choice of materials in addition to just learning how to find materials and information. What both of these call for, I think is, as Bob states above, "more systematic interaction between teaching faculty and librarians at the planning stage of course development." There's not much question that the most effective examples of teaching the use of library resources have been those that were built into a course, and I think we've only begun to explore ways of doing this.

The seminar at Jones House was most constructive and gratifying. We'd like to build on it. We will have soon a much more detailed account of its proceedings and are working on a compilation of the various applications of bibliographic instruction in a variety of courses. We'd appreciate comments and suggestions.

Evan Farber

What Have Been the Main Influences on your Development as a Teacher?

This Spring that question will be the focus of a set of interviews arranged between younger faculty and faculty with some years of experience at Earlham.

If we can learn what sorts of things have triggered improvements in teaching in the past, this surely will be of use to those who are thinking of Earlham's future. Specifically we wish to accomplish the following:

- provide direction to the Teaching and Learning Committee in performing its functions.
- obtain information useful to those outside of Earlham who are interested in what we are doing.
- increase serious conversation among teachers at Earlham about their teaching.

In a few days you will receive more information about this project and an invitation to participate. We hope you will consider this to be worth your time.

Jerry Bakker

Jim McDowell

Political Scientists Tell All

How do faculty at Earlham find out about the content and rationale of courses outside of their own department? Student scuttlebutt is not a bad source, if you have the time to talk to 10-15 students whom you know and who have taken the courses. But who has the time? Discussion of courses and curricula in Faculty Meeting is also not adequate, since it is too infrequent and there is usually little time for informal questions. The Natural Science Division has found a way to meet some of this need — we simply invite faculty in a department to come and tell us about what they are teaching.

In mid-February at one of the usual brown-bag meetings of the Science Division, Bob Johnstone, Hiroki Kato, and George Lopez talked about the Political Science curriculum, paying particular attention to the three courses which satisfy the distribution requirement. The purposes of these introductory courses are to introduce the basic terms characteristic of Political Science, to show how and where political Science is data-based, and finally to show how Political Science is normative or values-oriented. Discussion was open and friendly. It was a nutritious and informative hour.

Jerry Bakker

Rating Forms Used for Diagnostic Purposes

In order to aid in the use of course evaluation forms for diagnosis, the Teaching and Learning Committee would like to receive copies of any forms you used for this purpose during Winter Term. We urge you to share these forms with your colleagues, but also send us a copy. We will find a way to make them more generally available to the whole faculty. Give us a copy of the form along with any comments or suggestions for its use. If you elicited student feedback in some fashion more informal than by use of a printed form, we would like to hear what you did and how useful it was. Jot down a few comments and pass it along to any member of our committee.

Jerry Bakker

Women's Studies Workshop: We've Come a Long Way, Maybe

Teaching, learning and faculty development: these were the themes of the recent GLCA Workshop on Women's Studies. Hosted by Earlham on March 4-6, the conference concentrated on courses for and about women, whether taught by women or men.

Women's studies has been among the most exciting curricular innovations of recent years. As early as 1971, over 600 women-related courses had been registered with the Modern Language Association; another estimated one-half had eluded the MLA survey. By 1974, the emphasis had shifted from courses to complete degree-granting programs, usually at large universities.

But for small, liberal arts colleges, confronted with declining enrollment and fiscal stringency, other options are needed. Obviously, the most realistic alternative is not separate programs but reliance on extant faculty and courses. Thus, the general goal of our workshop was to boost women's studies by elevating the institutional incentive and faculty skills for incorporating women's studies into existing GLCA curricula. Several sessions focussed on successful strategies to organize student research, to incorporate community experiences into classroom work, to recruit and maintain supportive (often female) faculty, and to solicit grant support for women's studies. Additional disciplinary discussion groups (English, psychology, sociology, history) swapped syllabi and explored the special problems of their subject.

From beginning to end the conference benefited from consultant Florence Howe, former president of the MLA, editor of Women and the Power to Change and The Women's Studies Newsletter, and professor at

SUNY/Old Westbury. Howe applauded establishment of the GLCA Women's Studies Advisory Committee plus the plans for future workshops and an academic/research conference. She considered our consortial approach and focus on faculty development vital for the expansion of women's studies and "a pioneering effort" which could serve as a model for other small, liberal arts colleges.

Howe, appropriately, is a model herself: her own personal and professional evolution as a teacher reflects the larger historical development of women's studies. Like many at the conference, Howe developed her interest and research in women's studies from her involvement in and sympathy for feminism. From this experiential base, faculty have reaffirmed that a personal stance and the content of courses are inseparable — for either teacher or students.

The workshop left us with a sense of our unique opportunities, and responsibilities; to extend basic knowledge about women. To quote Howe: "Without a sense of their own identity, our women students are aliens in an essentially male world. They are anthropologists traveling in another culture." Consequently, a woman's past must be re-discovered and her present conscientiously and critically explored, then, we can anticipate that our teaching will create a knowledge and environment capable of fostering increased intellectual and personal autonomy for women -- and men.

Some faculty may be uncomfortable with this approach and may claim that this is unacademic because it is "consciousness raising". To the latter, the answer is "of course". Raising a person's consciousness is a primary goal of liberal education. Any education that does not impell its students to raise difficult questions about their society, or does not encourage them to relate immediate experiences to larger intellectual and social concerns, has not equipped its students to grapple realistically with the world beyond the campus.

Alice Almond Shrock

Summer Workshops on College Teaching

This summer the North Central Association is sponsoring several workshops which seem to have considerable promise. If you should be interested in attending one of these workshops, please see Joe Elmore or Jerry Bakker for further information. There is money available for paying expenses associated with attendance at these workshops.

Workshop on Interactional College Teaching and Learning, July 9-15
Oberlin College, George Langeler - Director

This six-day workshop will be of interest to those who want more cooperation between students and faculty in the educational process. The workshop is designed to facilitate the personal and professional growth of the college teacher. The theme-centered interactional approach, in which persons, their interaction, and mastery of knowledge and skills are of equal importance, will be utilized.

Workshop on College Teaching, August 9-13
University of Denver, James R. Davis - Director

This workshop focuses on four different theories about how people learn:

Behavioral learning theory

Cognitive psychology and information processing

The nature of inquiry

Group processes

Each theory is developed into a teaching strategy that can be employed by college teachers regardless of field.

Review: Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years: A Scheme. by William G. Perry, Jr., Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1970.

What does four years of college do to and/or for an American adolescent? Through a fifteen-year study of Harvard undergraduates, William Perry and his colleagues at the Harvard Bureau of Study Counsel addressed themselves to this question. Reporting on this study, the book carefully maps out a scheme of cognitive development for the late adolescent years. Like the developmental theories of Piaget and Kohlberg, this theory focuses on a stage sequencing of intellectual tasks. The Perry scheme proposes nine stages of intellectual and ethical development which can be grouped into three broader categories: dualism, relativism, and commitment in relativism.

In the dualistic stage, the world is seen in absolute terms - black or white. Knowledge is seen as either true or false and there is no room for uncertainty or ambiguity. From this stage, the professor is seen as the "giver-of-truth" and the student's role is to be the passive recipient of the gems which the professor dispenses.

In contrast, the relativistic stage finds the world engulfed in fog. All knowledge is seen as relative with each viewpoint having its own merit. The student sees the professor as a "presenter-of-positions" and the student's position as lost in the fog struggling for a direction. The student is able to understand and present a variety of viewpoints accurately but is unable to make his own choice among the multitude of positions.

In the commitment-in-relativism stage, the student returns to a more black and white view of the world. However, in contrast to the earlier dualistic stage, the student asserts his black and white position with an informed awareness of the arbitrary nature of the value system that he/she has imposed on the world. The professor is seen as a guide and clarifier but the student is now able to make informed choices from among the alternative positions and to independently formulate and assert his/her own views.

As may be intuited from this brief explanation, the Perry scheme overlaps in many important ways with Erickson's theoretical formulations, with the research of Harvey, Hunt and Schroeder and the college student studies of Heath. However, Perry more directly than the others focuses principally on intellectual issues and thereby his theory has more immediate implications for teaching. After delineating the stages, Perry discusses each in relation to educational goals and teaching techniques. He argues for careful assessment of each student's intellectual developmental level and the gearing of the class and/or instructional methods to meet the unique task of each stage.

As with all developmental theories, the Perry scheme is subject to abuse, such as the misuse of value-laden labels and over-generalization of theory application. However, the Perry scheme does provide an important conceptual tool with which to explore teaching and learning issues.

Applying the theory to Earlham from the students I've had in classes as well as the students I've seen in counseling and met in residence halls, my impression is that a large number of them seem to be in the relativistic stage. Frequently, I hear statements from students which are indicative of a relativistic world view: "Give me a position - any position - and I can logically defend it, but don't ask me to choose the one that makes most sense to me", or "Earlham has taught me to see things from a variety of viewpoints, but not how to decide on the best approach for any given situation." In this book and in a follow-up research report, Perry and others suggest some useful ways of helping students move through the relativistic stage into the commitment-in-relativism stage.

Even if you don't find answers (for those of you in the dualistic stage), I think the book does provide an interesting conceptual framework in which to examine your students' development and, perhaps, to reflect on your own intellectual journey.

Karl Schilling

Appendix C, Item 4

A LEARNED JOURNAL

TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE
EARLHAM COLLEGE, RICHMOND IND.

VOL. 2 NO. 2 MAR 7 1977

Instructional Development: Would you know one if you saw one?

Most people find considerable confusion in trying to differentiate between faculty development and instructional development. One way to separate these and begin to describe to you the kinds of activities I want to undertake in this area is to quote from Jerry Gaff's Toward Faculty Renewal. Gaff says "if faculty development focuses on faculty members, instructional development focuses on the conditions of learning, particularly courses and curricula, that they foster: and while faculty development emphasizes the improvement of teaching for faculty, instructional development emphasizes the improvement of learning for students." I originally became interested in doing work in this area during my last "hitch" at Earlham over four years ago. At that time, while trying to figure out better ways of teaching laboratory sections in the introductory psychology course, I began experimenting with simulations and games. There were some significant successes in using a simulation-game format for meeting some of the objectives of the course, but the most important lesson I learned was that my habitual way of attacking a course up to that time was not adequate. In examining the content to be covered, dividing it up into reasonable units to be organized in a linear fashion across the classroom hours, picking the best texts and resources I could find, and "having at it" with all the enthusiasm and interest I could muster, I was focusing too much on the mechanics of teaching and not enough on the problems of learning.

I discovered that there were many ways that I could vary the learning environment for my students that I had not even considered before when I thought about strategies of teaching. There are many rules we follow, many habitual ruts we tread only because we have not explored other ways of designing for learning. What we need to do is to consider the course resources, exercises and assignments, tests and papers as elements in a total environment which leads to particular kinds of behavior in students and faculty. We need to consider the informational and motivational exchanges that occur between students as well as between faculty and students. Then we can look at the goals of the instructor and the student in participating in a course, and try to find the appropriate arrangement of elements to facilitate learning.

Perhaps the easiest way to indicate what I mean is to use an example. I am presently working on a computer-classroom system which is designed to facilitate students helping each other to learn. The project started over four years ago when I began to consider one of the things I had noticed in my laboratories: in many cases students do a very good job of teaching each other. I recalled the tremendous amount of learning I did when I first began to teach, and remembered that many of the lab assistants had claimed that they had learned the subject matter much better as they had begun participating in teaching introductory students. I began wondering about how we could design instructional environments that would maximize the use of students in teaching as well as learning roles while insuring that their function in the teaching role would not be "the blind leading the blind." In talking of some of these interests to Jerry Woolpy I learned that he had experimented with having students generate questions and grade each others' exams in an upperclass course. He reported that many of the students in generating questions and grading exams felt that they had actually studied the material better. They had to study differently in order to carry out these new types of tasks which had been made a part of their educational environment. Obviously this kind of arrangement could be set up for small upperclass seminars with the instructor monitoring the questions generated and the comments given as Jerry had, but could such a system work with larger classes?

In thinking about it I realized that some of the major problems with this approach as the system grows larger are clerical ones in arranging for the proper interchanges among students and providing for the checking on the kinds of information they supply to each other. This kind of clerical task can, of course, be carried out very nicely by a computer. What we are now working on is something like a computer conferencing system. Under these conditions the computer acts like a super-telephone system which routes the different kinds of question, answer and comment "calls" to the proper parties, stores the information so it can be used at the right time, and generates summary reports so the instructor can see now the whole class or some sub-group is doing. We will shortly be running experiments with some students from one psychology and one biology course. If the system appears to be usable we hope to experiment on it in other disciplines as well and may be seeking your cooperation, critique and creative elaboration.

The focus of this work is not on changing the way the teacher teaches, but rather on re-designing the learning environment for the student. If you are interested in working on this or a related kind of problem with me, let me know.

Dick Johnson

GLCA Faculty Development Program

Last fall, the GLCA Faculty Development Board carried out a review of its work based on visits to all the GLCA campuses by GLCA faculty appointed as an "internal review team." Earlham faculty serving on this team were Jerry Bakker who visited Antioch and Kalamazoo College and Marilyn LaPlante who visited Dennison and Ohio Wesleyan. The visitor to the Earlham campus was Paul Dahlquist from Ohio Wesleyan and what follows are excerpts from his report.

Overview

Faculty development is an integral part of the Earlham College scene. Substantial sums of money and other kinds of institutional support have been allocated for on-campus efforts, and interest and activity are high. It is often difficult, if not impossible, to draw a line between GLCA Program impact and the impact of local programs. Undoubtedly, the dividing line is not important anyway--Earlham faculty are moving in many directions and GLCA Program resources have been a major impetus, even if not the only one.

In general, it is fair to say that support for individual projects was considered to be the most significant part of the GLCA Program. Workshops such as the Women's Studies Workshop held on the Earlham campus also had important impact, while the summer workshops for Fellows were felt to be the least satisfactory and of the least value. Yet despite the almost vehement opposition to the summer workshops felt by some, virtually all of the Fellows received some important benefits from those sessions, and one Fellow felt highly positive toward the summer sessions. In addition, the Faculty Development Program has strong administrative support at Earlham.

Most Significant Positive Outcomes of the Program

a. At the top of the list must be placed the work undertaken by the individual Fellows on their projects. I do not feel it necessary to go into the details of the projects in a brief report such as this. Suffice it to say that GLCA Program support has been well-received and well-used in this area. The Fellows of 1975 (David Weening, Robert Southard and William Stephenson) have essentially completed their project work and have seen important spinoff to other faculty members and to other interests held by the Fellows. This year's Fellows (Hal Hanes, Alice Shrock, Paula Sullivan and Andrea Jacoby) are working on their projects and they hold great promise.

b. Another important outcome of the various facets of the GLCA Program has been the cross-fertilization between faculty members of different schools and different disciplines. Virtually everyone involved reported this to be one of the most important outcomes of their involvement with the program.

c. The various workshops sponsored throughout the 1975-76 academic year by the GLCA Program have also had very positive outcomes. Partly because it was held on the Earlham campus, the Women's Studies Workshop had the most impact, but Earlham sent representatives to all of the five such workshops held. These workshops provided inspiration, some specific knowledge, and the opportunity to discuss areas of common interest with faculty from other institutions.

d. The idea of the GLCA Consultant Service was felt to be a good one, although it was recognized that the Service had been very much under-utilized to date. Earlham presently has three faculty members listed as consultants. It might be noted here that Earlham faculty have not used the GLCA Consultant Service as far as I am aware, at least partly because they have an active and widely accepted service on their own campus.

e. The opportunity for released time given to the Fellows was felt to be most beneficial. Projects would not have gotten done, at least not so soon, had this opportunity not been available.

Differences the Program Made in What People on Campus Talk about Concerning Teaching and Learning

I find it impossible to specify, in this instance, the impact of the GLCA Program. Earlham faculty certainly talk talk (sic) to one another about teaching and related issues. Some of this talk has explicitly arisen out of GLCA sponsored activities, but with the strong emphasis locally on faculty development and the strong sense of community at Earlham, it is probable that the kinds of things talked about have not changed, only the specifics. Nevertheless, the extent of talk on campus concerning teaching and learning issues was great and an impressive part of the Earlham scene.

Summary

Although the GLCA Faculty Development Program has been approached very critically and is seen to have some serious shortcomings by Earlham faculty, it is clear that support for the program is high. Participation in the various aspects of the program has been heavy and generally enthusiastic. Individual project support, interchange between GLCA faculty, and short, focused workshops were given the highest accolades, but other positive impacts have been noted.

Paul Dahlquist,
Ohio Wesleyan

Workshops, Conferences, Programs, Seminars, Etc.

Faculty development and teaching improvement are matters which can be explored in a bewildering array of meetings this spring and summer. Some of these are described here briefly to call your attention to the opportunities available. For further information about any of these meetings, see Jerry Bakker.

GLCA Summer Faculty Development Workshop

This will be held at Kenyon College, June 19-26, with the focus on the design, content, presentation and evaluation of a course. Participants are asked to bring materials for a course they will teach next year. Travel, housing and meal costs will be borne by the College. Those interested should see Joe Elmore immediately.

Indiana Conference on College Teaching

March 11 (this week - Friday) there will be a one-day conference at Indiana University with the objective of providing practical ideas for improving college teaching. Principal speakers will be Claude Mathis of Northwestern University and James Weigand of Indiana University. Cost is $6.35. Arrangements can be made by calling Dr. C. I. Chase at (812) 337-1595.

National Workshop on Evaluating a Competency Based Curriculum

Change magazine is sponsoring this workshop to be held March 31-April 1 in St. Louis, Missouri. The workshop is designed to help those at the point of evaluating programs of competency based instruction. Workshop personnel are Richard Meeth, Harold Hodgkinson, Bruce Francis and Robert Knott, all experienced consultants on competency based education. Cost is $75.00 for the workshop.

Conference on Faculty Development and Evaluation

The ERIC Clearinghouse and two divisions of the University of Florida are sponsoring this conference to be held March 30, 31 and April 1 in Orlando, Florida. Conference leaders include a number of persons nationally known in the area of faculty development. National Project III will lead one of the sessions, and then hold its own meeting after the conference is over. I will be in attendance as a National Project III Associate (J.B.).

Fourth National Conference on Personalized Instruction

Organized by the Center for Personalized Instruction at Georgetown University, this conference will be held April 15-17 in San Francisco. There will be addresses by Pat Cross, W. James Popham and Paolo Speller along with contributed papers on personalized instruction and a choice of professional development workshops. Registration cost is $40.00.

Fifth Annual Sagamore Seminar on Instructional Development

This seminar dealing with the management and procedures for academic innovation will be held at Syracuse University's Minnowbrook Conference Center in the Adirondacks, July 25-29. Conference plus housing and meals will cost $300.00.

Faculty and Institutional Development Program

For those interested in the competencies needed in faculty development, this program will be run August 1-12 by the National Training Laboratories in Bethel, Maine. Wally Sikes is the director, and total cost is $425.00.

Summer Simulation Workshop

This workshop will be held at the Dennison University Simulation Center, June 13-17, and will explore the application of simulation in the college curriculum. There will be specific seminars on simulation in disciplines ranging from biology to sociology to women's studies. Total cost will be $130.00.

Earlham Workshops

During Term III there will be workshops on bibliographic instruction (April 15), the use of discussions in teaching (April 23), and working with skill-deficient students (early April). Details will be forthcoming.

Appendix C, Item 5

Faculty Interviews

This is a description of the faculty interview project which we will follow up with a telephone call in a day or so asking if you will be willing to participate. Younger faculty will be asked to interview faculty who have had some years of teaching experience at Earlham. Each interviewer will be given the names of two faculty members who have agreed to be interviewed. Appointments of a half hour or so should be arranged by the interviewer.

The major question of the interview should be:

> "What have been the main influences on your development as a teacher?"

A more specific version could be:

> "What have been the change agents (programs, events, persons) which have contributed to the improvement of your teaching?"

Or the question could be:

> "What has made your teaching more effective, more efficient, or more enjoyable?"

In some cases it may help also to ask"

> "What is the evidence that improvement in teaching has occurred?"

The intent behind this project is to, 1) provide direction to the Teaching and Learning Committee in performing its functions, 2) obtain information useful to those outside of Earlham who are interested in what we are doing, and 3) increase serious conversation among teachers at Earlham about their teaching.

After the interview a brief report should be written and then turned in to Jerry Bakker or Jim McDowell who will write a brief summary. The reports will be kept confidential, and material drawn from them will be without names or identifying characteristics.

Jerry Bakker

Jim McDowell

David Weening

Faculty Interview Project

About one-fourth of the faculty at Earlham were interviewed by other faculty with the chief interview question being, "What have been the main influences on your development as a teacher?" Interviews usually ranged up to an hour in length and the reports were from 1 to 2 pages long. From personal comments, separate notes, and the reports themselves it was clear that the faculty had enjoyed getting together to talk about teaching. Those interviewed had an average of about 15 years of teaching experience, usually most of that at Earlham, and those who conducted the interviews were faculty who had been at Earlham four years or less. Interviewer--interviewee assignments were made with an eye to setting up compatible pairs and getting interviews across divisional lines.

Teaching is a complex process and faculty did not report a single main influence on their teaching. Nor could one identify a single event or person or program which had influenced the teaching of a number of faculty. But it is possible to identify six clusters of things which have been influential in the development of the teaching of Earlham faculty.

Teaching Climate Most frequently mentioned in the reports were things such as "atmosphere of the place," "the attitude towards teaching," "ongoing curricular innovation," "conversations with other teachers," "administrative support for instructional improvement," "importance of teaching and learning," and the like. It is difficult to define this category precisely, and it may be that better questions would have produced greater clarity, yet there is strong support for the idea that faculty have been influenced by a general atmosphere supportive of good teaching. Teachers talk about teaching here; innovation and experimentation are supported; what happens to student learning is important in the decision-making process.

Student Feedback Many teachers spoke of the importance in their teaching of the responses of students. This was the day-to-day response as noted in the laboratory, in personal conversations, in the field, in working together on research projects, or in the classroom. For these teachers, student feedback was a factor which affected how they teach, not just an intrinsic reward for good teaching. It is significant that of those who mentioned formal student evaluations, all but one felt that these evaluations were of no value or had a negative impact on their teaching. Where student feedback influenced teaching was in the informal, daily contact which provided clues as to what was working and what was not.

Teacher Models A number of faculty reported that they were aware of specific individuals who served in some way as models for their own teaching. In some cases a set of ideals was seen as worth following, sometimes a particular personal trait or teaching technique was mentioned, and sometimes a pattern of working with students was specified. Faculty are selective in what they choose to emulate in their models, using that which suits their own teaching styles. Some of the models were undergraduate teachers, some graduate teachers or thesis advisors, and some fellow Earlham faculty.

Meeting New Challenges A significant influence in the teaching of a number of faculty was the successful meeting of a new challenge. Teachers tried something new and found it worked. They spoke of how reluctance and trepidation became converted into a growing self-confidence. A number of teachers talked about the importance of experience and how an awareness of what one could do successfully could contribute to self-confidence, a necessary element of good teaching. It is disturbing to consider the possibility that increasing the emphasis on the improvement of teaching may, in fact, undermine this necessary self-confidence.

Working in One's Discipline The interview questions were not cast in such a way as to elicit responses related to a teacher's discipline, yet a number of faculty reported that they found a significant influence there. Research, either with or without students, was considered important. Teachers find inspiration in their own subject matter. Reading in one's field and doing scholarly work were reported as having an impact on teaching. Teachers in the performing arts find performance to be important.

The faculty interview project has not uncovered a previously hidden lever one can pull to improve the quality of teaching. It showed us again how complex and individualistic a process teaching is, and it showed us the importance of an atmosphere supportive of good teaching. Perhaps most importantly, faculty were brought together in another way to talk about teaching, the chief function of an educational institution.